

		L. W. St. John, executive committee .....	58.16
	11	J. L. Griffith, executive committee .....	66.10
	22	Wesleyan Alumni Council, addressing .....	1.00
	25	W. E. Meanwell, basketball rules committee .....	121.70
June	3	Hazen's Bookstore, record book .....	.65
	5	Pelton and King, printing and postage .....	40.34
	6	Joseph Stubbs, ice hockey rules committee .....	31.16
	13	J. E. Lowrey, ice hockey rules committee .....	26.25
		Yahnundasis Golf Club, ice hockey rules committee .....	33.75
	17	Lawson Robertson, track rules committee .....	99.01
		Clyde Littlefield, track rules committee .....	87.55
		F. W. Nicolson, secretary's allowance .....	500.00
	24	R. G. Clapp, wrestling rules committee .....	4.15
		B. E. Wiggins, wrestling rules committee .....	9.06
	25	Middletown National Bank, exchange .....	.12
	27	H. J. Huff, track rules committee .....	34.19
July	2	L. F. Keller, ice hockey rules committee .....	92.78
	3	C. M. Updegraff, committee on Federal tax .....	65.53
	10	Princeton University Press, athletic injuries hand- book .....	3.86
		H. W. Hughes, track rules committee .....	62.07
		R. A. Fetzter, track rules committee .....	75.60
	15	L. W. St. John, Olympic rules committee .....	10.00
Aug.	2	E. A. Thomas, track rules committee .....	41.10
Sept.	17	Wesleyan Store, postage .....	3.00
		R. L. Sackett, executive committee .....	25.13
	23	F. W. Nicolson, executive committee .....	10.00
	25	J. L. Griffith, executive committee .....	82.05
	26	R. L. Sackett, executive committee .....	30.76
	27	Harvard Club of New York, executive committee .....	23.36
Oct.	1	E. Cowie, stenographic work .....	50.00
	5	Wesleyan Store, postage .....	20.00
		G. T. Kirby, dues American Olympic Association .....	25.00
	10	G. T. Kirby, dues American Olympic Association .....	25.00
		F. R. Eastwood, committee on football fatalities .....	62.50
	14	S. N. E. Telephone Co., telegrams .....	2.30
Nov.	6	Pelton and King, printing and postage .....	88.12
	7	G. T. Kirby, dues American Olympic Association .....	500.00
	26	Middletown National Bank, exchange .....	.10
	29	W. E. Meanwell, basketball rules committee .....	89.20
Dec.	5	W. R. Okeson, football rules committee .....	25.50
	6	H. J. Stegeman, football rules committee .....	86.13
	12	Middletown National Bank, exchange .....	.10
	14	Sportsmanship Brotherhood, dues .....	10.00
	16	Hotel Sherman, Chicago, football rules committee .....	7.06
	28	Amount carried forward .....	5,538.35
			\$11,677.43

PROCEEDINGS OF THE THIRTY-FIRST ANNUAL  
CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL COL-  
LEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION,  
DECEMBER 27-29, 1936

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Officers of the Association - - - - -	2
Rules Committees for 1937 - - - - -	3
Roll of Members - - - - -	6
Delegates and Visitors present - - - - -	14
Proceedings of Convention of 1936 - - - - -	17
Reports of Districts - - - - -	21
Reports of Rules Committees:	
Association Football (Soccer) - - - - -	39
Basketball - - - - -	40
Boxing - - - - -	41
Fencing - - - - -	43
Football - - - - -	44
Gymnastics - - - - -	48
Ice Hockey - - - - -	49
Swimming - - - - -	51
Track and Field - - - - -	55
Wrestling - - - - -	58
Reports of Special Committees:	
Radio Broadcasting of College Games - - - - -	63
Influences inimical to best Interests of College Sport - - - - -	72
Eligibility for N. C. A. A. Meets - - - - -	76
Federal Admissions Tax - - - - -	79
Addresses at the Convention:	
Presidential Address—John L. Griffith - - - - -	82
President R. C. Hutchison - - - - -	90
President J. L. McConaughy - - - - -	98
President Thurston J. Davies - - - - -	106
Appendix I.—Reports of Round Table Conferences - - - - -	113
Appendix II.—Report of Treasurer for 1936 - - - - -	153



## OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

1937

### HONORARY PRESIDENTS

Brigadier General Palmer E. Pierce, Room 1616, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.  
Professor Charles W. Kennedy, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

### PRESIDENT

Major J. L. Griffith, Hotel Sherman, Chicago, Ill.

### SECRETARY-TREASURER

Professor Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

### COUNCIL

(In addition to the President and Secretary the following vice-presidents, *ex officio*.)

First District, Mr. Malcolm Farmer, Yale University.  
Second District, Professor P. O. Badger, New York University.  
Third District, Professor N. W. Dougherty, University of Tennessee.  
Fourth District, Professor R. W. Aigler, University of Michigan.  
Fifth District, Professor H. H. King, Kansas State College.  
Sixth District, Professor E. W. McDiarmid, Texas Christian University.  
Seventh District, Dr. H. L. Marshall, University of Utah.  
Eighth District, Professor H. C. Willett, University of Southern California.

### Members at Large\*

Professor C. E. Bilheimer, Gettysburg College.  
President T. J. Davies, Colorado College.  
Director R. A. Fetzer, University of North Carolina.  
Professor W. J. Livingston, Denison University.  
Professor T. N. Metcalf, University of Chicago.  
Professor S. C. Palmer, Swarthmore College.  
Dr. J. E. Raycroft, Princeton University.

### EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The president and secretary, *ex officio*  
Professor P. O. Badger    Mr. Romeyn Berry    Director W. J. Bingham  
Professor H. H. King    Dr. J. E. Raycroft    Professor H. C. Willett  
Professor L. W. St. John

\* Elected by the Council.

## RULES COMMITTEES FOR 1937

For football, basketball, and track the figures 1, 2, 3, and 4 before the name of a member of the committee indicate that he is to serve one, two, three, or four years, beginning this year.

### Association Football Rules

Burnham M. Dell, Princeton University, Chairman; Thomas Dent, Dartmouth College; Robert Dunn, Swarthmore College; Douglas Stewart, University of Pennsylvania.

Advisory Committee: H. W. Clark, Lafayette College; A. W. Marsh, Amherst College; N. M. Fleming, Penn. State College; N. A. Kellogg, Lehigh University; S. C. Staley, University of Illinois; J. H. Schroeder, University of California at Los Angeles.

### Baseball

Edgar Fauver, Wesleyan University, Chairman; L. C. Boles, Wooster College; W. J. Disch, University of Texas; Dorsett Graves, University of Washington.

Advisory Committee: H. J. Stegeman, University of Georgia; R. L. Fisher, University of Michigan; Sam Barry, University of Southern California.

### Basketball Rules

L. W. St. John, Ohio State University, Chairman; Oswald Tower, Andover Academy, Editor; James A. Naismith, University of Kansas, Life Member; (1) Henry Crisp, 3rd district; James St. Clair, 6th district; (2) W. E. Meanwell, 4th district; Willard Witte, 7th district; (3) H. H. Salmon, Jr., 2nd district; John Bunn, 8th district; (4) Sumner A. Dole, 1st district; Forrest C. Allen, 5th district.

### Boxing Rules

Hugo Bezdek, Penn. State College, Chairman; Wm. H. Cowell, University of New Hampshire; J. G. Driver, University of Virginia; Commander A. C. McFall, U. S. Naval Academy; I. F. Toomey, University of California at Davis; Capt. Thomas M. Watlington, U. S. Military Academy.

### Fencing Rules

H. V. Alessandrini, Columbia University, Chairman; George H. Breed, Harvard University; John H. Hanway, Yale University; Joseph Levis, Mass. Institute of Technology; Harold Van Buskirk, University of Pennsylvania.



### *Football Rules*

Walter Okeson, Lehigh University, Chairman; W. S. Langford, New York City, Secretary; A. A. Stagg, College of the Pacific (Life Member); (1) W. O. Hunter, 8th district; Morley Jennings, 6th district; (2) W. G. Crowell, 2nd district; L. Mahoney, 7th district; (3) W. J. Bingham, 1st district; D. X. Bible, 5th district; (4) W. A. Alexander, 3rd district; F. H. Yost, 4th district.

### *Gymnastic Rules*

D. L. Hoffer, University of Chicago, Chairman; John A. Davis, Stevens Institute of Technology; C. W. Graydon, Flushing, N. Y.; Claude Simons, Tulane University.

Advisory Committee: Christopher A. Beling, Newark, N. J.; Fred W. Ball, Princeton University; Harry Maloney, Stanford University; Ray Moore, New York University; Granville B. Johnson, University of Denver; R. K. Cutler, University of Oregon.

### *Ice Hockey Rules*

Albert I. Prettyman, Hamilton College, Chairman; J. O. Bulkley, Yale University; Louis F. Keller, University of Minnesota; Joseph Stubbs, Harvard University; L. K. Neidlinger, Dartmouth College.

Advisory Committee: Arnold Eddy, University of Southern California; Gerard Hallock, III, Princeton University; Lieut. M. S. Carter, U. S. Military Academy; Donald D. Sands, Boston, Mass.; Rev. F. H. Sill, O.H.C., Kent School; A. G. Smith, Pres. Eastern Hockey Officials Ass'n.

### *Lacrosse Rules*

H. J. Rockafeller, Rutgers College, Chairman; John Faber, University of Maryland; Avery Blake, Swarthmore College; Kenneth Fairman, Princeton University; Roy Simons, Syracuse University.

Advisory Committee: R. D. Root, Yale University; J. B. Crenshaw, Georgia School of Technology; L. B. Johnston, Dartmouth College; Frank W. Candee, State College of Washington; E. W. Christensen, University of New Hampshire.

### *Swimming Rules*

R. J. H. Kiphuth, Yale University, Chairman; A. E. Eilers, Washington University; Edward T. Kennedy, Columbia Uni-

versity; Neils Thorpe, University of Minnesota; Fred Cady, University of Southern California; C. E. Forsythe, High School Federation.

Advisory Committee: F. W. Luehring, University of Pennsylvania; Ernst Brandsten, Stanford University; David Armbruster, University of Iowa; Radford McCormick, College of the City of New York; R. B. Miller, Bowdoin College; Mike Peppe, Ohio State University; Col. Paul Parker, Mississippi State University; G. W. Scott, Trinidad State Junior College; G. P. Doherty, University of Delaware; Julian W. Robertson, University of Texas.

### *Track Rules*

K. L. Wilson, 4th district, Chairman; (1) R. A. Fetzer, 3rd district; H. W. Hughes, 7th district; (2) Lawson Robertson, 2nd district; (3) Franklin P. Johnson, 5th district; Brutus Hamilton, 8th district; (4) Fred Tutell, 1st district; Emmett A. Brunson, 6th district.

### *Wrestling Rules*

R. G. Clapp, University of Nebraska, Chairman; C. F. Foster, Princeton University; C. P. Miles, Virginia Polytechnic Institute; Dr. J. A. Rockwell, Mass. Institute of Technology; E. G. Schroeder, University of Iowa; D. B. Swingle, Montana State College; P. E. Wiggins, High School Federation.

Advisory Committee: E. C. Gallagher, Oklahoma A. & M. College; J. Hancock, Colorado Teachers College; R. J. McLean, University of Texas; Hugo Otopolik, Iowa State College; Maj. H. M. Reed, Virginia Military Institute; Wm. Sheridan, Lehigh University; Briggs Hunt, University of California at Los Angeles; Richard K. Cole, Brown University.



## ROLL OF MEMBERS

### COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

#### First District

Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., Stanley King, LL.D., President.  
 Bates College, Lewiston, Maine, Clifton D. Gray, Ph.D., LL.D., President.  
 Boston College, Boston, Mass., Rev. Louis J. Gallagher, Ph.D., President.  
 Boston University, Boston, Mass., Daniel L. Marsh, Ph.D., LL.D., President.  
 Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine, Kenneth C. M. Sills, LL.D., President.  
 Brown University, Providence, R. I., Clarence A. Barbour, S.T.D., LL.D., President.  
 Connecticut State College, Storrs, Conn., Albert M. Jorgenson, President.  
 Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H., Ernest M. Hopkins, LL.D., President.  
 Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., James B. Conant, Ph.D., President.  
 International Y. M. C. A. College, Springfield, Mass., L. L. Doggett, Ph.D., President.  
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., Karl T. Compton, Sc.D., President.  
 Massachusetts State College, Amherst, Mass., Hugh P. Baker, M.F., President.  
 Middlebury College, Middlebury, Vt., Paul Dwight Moody, D.D., President.  
 Norwich University, Northfield, Vt., Porter H. Adams, M.S., President.  
 Rhode Island State College, Kingston, R. I., Raymond G. Bressler, M.S., President.  
 Trinity College, Hartford, Conn., Rev. Remsen B. Ogilby, LL.D., President.  
 Tufts College, Medford, Mass., John A. Cousens, LL.D., President.  
 United States Coast Guard Academy, New London, Conn., Capt. E. D. Jones, U. S. C. G., Superintendent.  
 University of Maine, Orono, Me., Arthur A. Hauck, Ph.D., President.  
 University of New Hampshire, Durham, N. H., Edward M. Lewis, LL.D., President.  
 University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt., Guy W. Bailey, LL.D., President.  
 Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., James L. McConaughy, Ph.D., LL.D., President.  
 Williams College, Williamstown, Mass., Tyler Dennett, Ph.D., LL.D., President.  
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, Mass., Captain Ralph Earle, U.S.N., President.  
 Yale University, New Haven, Conn., James Rowland Angell, Litt.D., President.

#### Second District

Alfred University, Alfred, N. Y., J. Nelson Norwood, Ph.D., President.  
 Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa., William P. Tolley, Ph.D., LL.D., President.  
 Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, N. Y., Harry S. Rogers, Sc.D., President.  
 Canisius College, Buffalo, N. Y., Rev. James P. Sweeney, S.J., President.  
 Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pa., Charles Watkins, Ph.D., Acting president.

Clarkson College of Technology, Potsdam, N. Y., James Shelby Thomas, M.A., President.  
 Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., George B. Cutten, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., President.  
 College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y., Frederick B. Robinson, Ph.D., President.  
 Columbia University, New York, N. Y., Nicholas Murray Butler, Ph.D., LL.D., President.  
 Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., Livingston Farrand, M.D., LL.D., President.  
 Drexel Institute, Philadelphia, Pa., Parke R. Kolbe, Ph.D., President.  
 Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., Fred P. Corson, D.D., President.  
 Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa., Rev. J. J. Callahan, LL.D., President.  
 Fordham University, New York, N. Y., Rev. A. J. Hogan, Ph.D., President.  
 Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., Henry H. Apple, D.D., LL.D., President.  
 Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Pa., McLeod M. Pearce, D.D., President.  
 Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa., Henry W. A. Hanson, D.D., LL.D., President.  
 Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y., Frederick C. Ferry, Sc.D., LL.D., President.  
 Haverford College, Haverford, Pa., W. W. Comfort, Ph.D., Litt.D., President.  
 Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y., William Alfred Eddy, Ph.D., LL.D., President.  
 Ithaca College, Ithaca, N. Y., Leonard Bliss Job, Ph.D., President.  
 Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., William M. Lewis, LL.D., President.  
 Lehigh University, S. Bethlehem, Pa., Clarence C. Williams, President.  
 Manhattan College, New York, N. Y., Brother Patrick, President.  
 New York University, New York, N. Y., Harry W. Chase, Ph.D., LL.D., Chancellor.  
 Niagara University, Niagara Falls, N. Y., Joseph M. Noonan, S.T.D., President.  
 Pennsylvania Military College, Chester, Pa., Frank K. Hyatt, LL.D., President.  
 Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa., Ralph D. Hetzel, LL.D., Litt.D., President.  
 Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., Harold W. Dodds, Ph.D., President.  
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N. Y., William O. Hotchkiss, Ph.D., President.  
 Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J., Robert C. Clothier, LL.D., President.  
 St. Lawrence University, Canton, N. Y., Laurens H. Seelye, President.  
 State Teachers College, West Chester, Pa., Norman W. Cameron, Ph.D., President.  
 Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken, N. J., H. N. Davis, Ph.D., President.  
 Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa., Rev. G. Morris Smith, D.D., President.  
 Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa., Frank Aydelotte, LL.D., D.Litt., President.  
 Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y., Charles W. Flint, D.D., LL.D., Chancellor.  
 Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa., Charles E. Beury, LL.B., President.  
 Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., Dixon R. Fox, Ph.D., President.  
 United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., Major General W. D. Connor, U.S.A., Superintendent.



University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y., Samuel P. Capen, Ph.D., President.  
 University of Delaware, Newark, Del., Walter Hulihan, Ph.D., D.C.L., LL.D., President.  
 University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., Thomas S. Gates, LL.D., President.  
 University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa., John G. Bowman, LL.D., Chancellor.  
 University of Rochester, Rochester, N. Y., Alan C. Valentine, LL.D., Villanova College, Villanova, Pa., Rev. E. V. Stanford, LL.D., President.  
 West Virginia University, Morgantown, W. Va., Charles S. Boucher, Ph.D., President.

### *Third District*

Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala., Luther N. Duncan, LL.D., President.  
 Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., Right Rev. James H. Ryan, Ph.D., LL.D., President.  
 Centenary College, Shreveport, La., Pierce Cline, M.A., President.  
 Citadel, The, Charleston, S. C., General Charles P. Summerall, President.  
 Clemson Agricultural College, Clemson College, S. C., Enoch W. Sikes, Ph.D., President.  
 College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Va., J. A. C. Chandler, Ph.D., President.  
 Duke University, Durham, N. C., William P. Few, Ph.D., LL.D., President.  
 Furman University, Greenville, S. C., Bennette Eugene Geer, Litt.D., President.  
 Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., Rev. W. C. Nevils, Ph.D., President.  
 Georgia School of Technology, Atlanta, Ga., Marion L. Brittain, LL.D., President.  
 Howard University, Washington, D. C., Mordecai W. Johnson, D.D., President.  
 Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., Isaiah Bowman, Sc.D., President.  
 King College, Bristol, Tenn., Thomas P. Johnston, D.D., President.  
 Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston, La., G. W. Bond, President.  
 Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La., James Monroe Smith, President.  
 Loyola University, New Orleans, La., J. W. Hynes, S.J., D.D., President.  
 Mississippi State College, State College, Miss., G. D. Humphrey, President.  
 Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., Monsignor B. J. Bradley, LL.D., President.  
 Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla., Hamilton Holt, Litt.D., LL.D., President.  
 Tulane University, New Orleans, La., A. B. Dinwiddie, LL.D., President.  
 United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., Rear Admiral D. F. Sellers, U.S.N., Superintendent.  
 University of Alabama, University, Ala., George H. Denny, Ph.D., LL.D., President.  
 University of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md., B. Herbert Brown, Jr., LL.B., Vice-president.  
 University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla., John J. Tigert, D.C.L., LL.D., President.  
 University of Georgia, Athens, Ga., S. V. Sanford, Litt.D., President.  
 University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky., Frank L. McVey, Ph.D., LL.D., President.  
 University of Maryland, College Park, Md., H. C. Byrd, Acting president.

University of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla., B. F. Ashe, LL.D., President.  
 University of Mississippi, University, Miss., Alfred B. Butts, Chancellor.  
 University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C., Frank P. Graham, LL.D., D.C.L., President.  
 University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C., Leonard T. Baker, LL.D., President.  
 University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., Benjamin F. Finney, LL.D., President.  
 University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tenn., James D. Hoskins, LL.B., President.  
 University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., John L. Newcomb, B.A., C.E., President.  
 Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., J. H. Kirkland, Ph.D., D.C.L., LL.D., Chancellor.  
 Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va., Gen. J. A. Lejeune, Superintendent.  
 Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va., Julian A. Burruss, Ph.D., President.  
 Wake Forest College, Wake Forest, N. C., Thurman D. Kitchin, M.D., President.  
 Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va., Francis P. Gaines, Ph.D., Litt.D., President.

### *Fourth District*

Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria, Ill., Frederic R. Hamilton, Ph.D., President.  
 Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind., James W. Putnam, Ph.D., President.  
 Carleton College, Northfield, Minn., Donald J. Cowling, D.D., LL.D., President.  
 Case School of Applied Science, Cleveland, Ohio, William E. Wickenden, Sc.D., President.  
 Denison University, Granville, Ohio, Avery A. Shaw, D.D., President.  
 DePauw University, Greencastle, Ind., G. Bromley Oxnam, D.D., President.  
 Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Ind., Ralph N. Tirey, A.M., President.  
 Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., William L. Bryan, Ph.D., LL.D., President.  
 Knox College, Galesburg, Ill., Albert Britt, Litt.D., President.  
 Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis., Henry M. Wriston, Ph.D., LL.D., President.  
 Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., William M. Magee, S.J., LL.D., President.  
 Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, Alfred H. Upham, Ph.D., LL.D., President.  
 Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich., Robert S. Shaw, B.S.A., President.  
 Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti, Mich., Charles McKenny, LL.D., President.  
 Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill., Walter D. Scott, Ph.D., President.  
 Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio, Ernest H. Wilkins, Ph.D., President.  
 Ohio Northern University, Ada, Ohio, Robert Williams, D.D., LL.D., President.  
 Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, George W. Rightmire, M.A., President.  
 Ohio University, Athens, Ohio, Edwin W. Chubb, Litt.D., LL.D., President.  
 Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, Edmund D. Soper, D.D., President.



Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., Edward C. Elliott, Ph.D., President.  
 University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., Robert M. Hutchins, LL.D., President.  
 University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, Raymond Walters, M.A., President.  
 University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich., Albert H. Poetker, LL.D., President.  
 University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., Arthur C. Willard, LL.D., President.  
 University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., Alexander G. Ruthven, Ph.D., President.  
 University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn., Lotus D. Coffman, Ph.D., President.  
 University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind., Rev. J. F. O'Hara, C.S.C., President.  
 University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis., Glenn Frank, Litt.D., LL.D., President.  
 Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, Winfred G. Leutner, Ph.D., President.  
 Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Mich., Dwight B. Waldo, LL.D., President.  
 Wooster College, Wooster, Ohio, Charles F. Wishart, D.D., President.

#### *Fifth District*

Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Harry M. Gage, LL.D., President.  
 Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa, Rev. Herbert J. Burgstahler, President.  
 Creighton University, Omaha, Neb., Rev. P. J. Mahan, LL.D., President.  
 Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, Daniel W. Morehouse, Ph.D., President.  
 Grinnell College, Grinnell, Iowa, John S. Nollen, Ph.D., LL.D., President.  
 Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa, Charles E. Friley, President.  
 Iowa State Teachers College, Cedar Falls, Iowa.  
 Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans., F. D. Farrell, Agr.D., President.  
 Oklahoma A. and M. College, Stillwater, Okla., Henry G. Bennett, Ph.D., President.  
 St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo., Robert S. Johnston, S.J., S.T.D., President.  
 Southwestern State Teachers College, Weatherford, Okla.  
 State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, Eugene A. Gilmore, LL.D., President.  
 University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans., Ernest H. Lindley, Ph.D., Chancellor.  
 University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., Walter Williams, LL.D., President.  
 University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb., Edgar A. Burnett, Sc.D., Chancellor.  
 University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, N. Dak., John C. West, President.  
 University of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla., William B. Bizzell, Ph.D., LL.D., President.  
 University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Okla., Clarence I. Pontius, B.S., President.  
 University of Wichita, Wichita, Kans., William M. Jardine, LL.D., President.  
 Washburn College, Topeka, Kans., Philip C. King, D.D., President.  
 Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., G. R. Throop, Ph.D., Chancellor.

#### *Sixth District*

Baylor University, Waco, Texas, Pat M. Neff, LL.D., President.  
 Rice Institute, Houston, Texas, Edgar O. Lovett, Ph.D., LL.D., President.

Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas, C. C. Selecman, D.D., President.  
 Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College, College Station, Texas, Thomas O. Walton, LL.D., President.  
 Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Texas, Edward M. Waits, LL.D., President.  
 University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz., Paul S. Burgess, Ph.D., President.  
 University of Texas, Austin, Texas, H. Y. Benedict, Ph.D., LL.D., President.

#### *Seventh District*

Colorado Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Col., Charles A. Lory, LL.D., Sc.D., President.  
 University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo., George Norlin, Ph.D., LL.D., President.  
 University of Denver, Denver, Colo., David Shaw Duncan, Ph.D., LL.D., President.  
 University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, George Thomas, Ph.D., President.

#### *Eighth District*

College of Agriculture, University of California, Davis, Cal., Robert G. Sproul, LL.D., President.  
 Oregon State College, Corvallis, Ore., G. W. Peavy, President.  
 San Jose State College, San Jose, Cal., Thomas W. MacQuarrie, Ph.D., President.  
 Stanford University, Stanford University, Cal., Ray Lyman Wilbur, Sc.D., LL.D., President.  
 State College of Washington, Pullman, Wash., Ernest O. Holland, Ph.D., President.  
 University of California, Berkeley, Cal., Robert G. Sproul, LL.D., President.  
 University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, M. Gordon Neale, Ph.D., President.  
 University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore., C. Valentine Boyer, Ph.D., President.  
 University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Cal., R. B. von Kleinsmid, Sc.D., LL.D., President.  
 University of Washington, Seattle, Wash., Lee Paul Sieg, Ph.D., President.

#### ALLIED MEMBERS

Border Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

Arizona State Teachers College (Flagstaff)	Texas Technological College
Arizona State Teachers College (Tempe)	Texas College of Mines and Metallurgy
New Mexico A. & M. College	University of Arizona
	University of New Mexico

Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia	Kansas State Teachers College of Pittsburg
Fort Hays Kansas State College	Municipal University of Wichita
	Southwestern College



Colored Intercollegiate Athletic Association, comprising:

Bluefield State Teachers College	St. Augustine's College
Hampton Institute	St. Paul Normal and Industrial School
Howard University	Shaw University
Lincoln University	Johnson C. Smith University
Morgan College	Virginia State College
North Carolina A. & T. College	Virginia Union University
North Carolina State College	

Kansas College Athletic Association, comprising:

Bethany College	Ottawa University
St. Mary's College	McPherson College
Baker University	Kansas Wesleyan University

Middle Atlantic States College Athletic Conference, comprising:

Bucknell University	Muhlenberg College
Columbia University	New York University
University of Delaware	University of Pennsylvania
Drexel Institute	Pennsylvania Military College
Franklin and Marshall College	Princeton University
Gettysburg College	Rutgers University
Haverford College	Stevens Institute
Johns Hopkins University	Susquehanna University
Juniata College	Ursinus College
Lebanon Valley College	Washington College
Lehigh University	

Mid-West Collegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

Beloit College	Knox College
Carleton College	Lawrence College
Coe College	Monmouth College
Cornell College	Ripon College

Missouri Valley Intercollegiate Athletic Association, comprising:

Iowa State College	University of Missouri
Kansas State Agricultural College	University of Nebraska
University of Kansas	University of Oklahoma

Missouri Valley Conference, comprising:

Creighton University	Tulsa University
Drake University	Washburn College
Grinnell College	Washington University
Oklahoma A. & M. College	

Pacific Coast Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

Oregon Agricultural College	University of Oregon
Stanford University	University of Southern California
State College of Washington	University of Washington
State University of Montana	University of California, at Los Angeles
University of California	
University of Idaho	

Rocky Mountain Faculty Athletic Conference, comprising:

University of Colorado	Utah Agricultural College
Colorado State School of Mines	Colorado Agricultural College
Colorado College	Colorado State Teachers College
University of Denver	Western State Teachers College
Brigham Young University	Montana State College
University of Utah	University of Wyoming

Southern Conference, comprising:

Clemson College	University of South Carolina
Duke University	University of Virginia
University of Maryland	Virginia Military Institute
North Carolina State College	Virginia Polytechnic Institute
University of North Carolina	Washington and Lee University

Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

Morehouse College	Florida A. & M. College
Morris Brown College	Knoxville College
Alabama State Teachers College	Fisk University
Talladega College	Le Moyne College
Tuskegee Institute	S. Carolina A. & M. College
Lane College	Xavier University
Clark University	

Southeastern Conference, comprising:

University of Alabama	Mississippi A. & M. College
Alabama Polytechnic Institute	University of Mississippi
University of Florida	University of the South
Georgia School of Technology	University of Tennessee
University of Georgia	Tulane University
University of Kentucky	Vanderbilt University
Louisiana State University	

Southern California Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

California Institute of Technology	San Diego State Teachers College
Occidental College	University of Redlands
Pomona College	Whittier College
La Verne College	Santa Barbara State Teachers College

Southwest Athletic Conference, comprising:

Baylor University	Texas University
Rice Institute	University of Arkansas
Southern Methodist University	Texas Christian University
A. & M. College of Texas	

Southwestern Athletic Conference, comprising:

Bishop College	Langston University
Wiley College	Southern University
Texas College	Prairie View State Normal College
Samuel Houston College	

Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, comprising:

College of William and Mary	Roanoke College
Emory and Henry College	University of Richmond

Western Conference, comprising:

University of Chicago	University of Minnesota
University of Illinois	Northwestern University
University of Indiana	Ohio State University
University of Iowa	Purdue University
University of Michigan	University of Wisconsin

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

Andover Academy, Andover, Mass.  
Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.  
Mercersburg Academy, Mercersburg, Pa.



## LIST OF DELEGATES AND VISITORS AT THE THIRTY-FIRST CONVENTION

(Not all those in attendance registered with the Secretary, therefore this list is undoubtedly incomplete.)

### I. MEMBER INSTITUTIONS:

Alfred University: J. A. McLane, J. K. Cox.  
Amherst College: A. W. Marsh, A. G. Wheeler.  
Bates College: O. F. Cutts.  
Boston College: F. V. Sullivan.  
Boston University: J. M. Harmon.  
Brown University: S. T. Arnold, F. W. Marvel, T. W. Taylor, L. E. Swain.  
Carnegie Institute: Clarence Overend.  
Case School: C. L. Eddy, R. A. Ride.  
Coe College: M. L. Eby.  
Colgate University: P. G. Rockafellow.  
College of the City of New York: Walter Williamson, William Rosenthal.  
Conn. State College: W. H. Kinsey, George Van Bibber, R. J. Guyer, J. O. Christian.  
Cornell University: Romeyn Berry, James Lynah, H. S. Godshall, Jr.  
Dartmouth College: R. J. Delahanty.  
Denison University: W. J. Livingston.  
Drexel Institute: Dawson Dowell.  
Duke University: W. H. Wannamaker, Carl Voyles.  
Fordham University: C. J. Deane, J. F. Coffey.  
Georgia Tech.: A. H. Armstrong, W. A. Alexander.  
Gettysburg College: C. E. Bilheimer.  
Hamilton College: J. M. Gélas.  
Harvard University: W. J. Bingham, A. W. Samborski, R. C. Harlow, Neil Stahley.  
Howard University: Frank Coleman, J. H. Burr.  
Indiana University: Z. G. Clevenger.  
International Y. M. C. A. College: G. B. Affleck, E. J. Hickox, L. J. Judd.  
Iowa State College: G. F. Veenker.  
Iowa State University: O. M. Solem, C. M. Updegraff.  
Kansas State College: M. F. Ahearn, H. H. King.  
Lafayette College: H. W. Clark.  
Lehigh University: N. A. Kellogg, W. R. Okeson.  
Mass. Institute of Technology: J. A. Rockwell, R. T. Jope.  
Miami University: G. L. Rider, Frank Wilton.  
Michigan State College: R. C. Huston, R. H. Young, L. L. Frimodig.  
Middlebury College: A. M. Brown.  
New York University: P. O. Badger, Albert Rosenthal.  
Oberlin College: J. H. Nichols.  
Ohio University: O. C. Bird.  
Ohio Northern University: Cliffe Deming.  
Ohio State University: T. E. French, L. W. St. John, H. S. Wood.  
Penn. State College: R. L. Sackett.  
Princeton University: J. E. Raycroft, A. S. Bushnell.  
Rice Institute: H. A. Scott.  
Rutgers University: G. E. Little.  
St. Louis University: C. E. Muellerleile.

Susquehanna University: G. M. Smith.  
Swarthmore College: S. C. Palmer, C. C. Miller, R. H. Dunn.  
Syracuse University: L. A. Bryan.  
Temple University: E. R. Yeomans.  
Trinity College: Ray Oosting, W. S. Langford.  
Tufts College: C. P. Houston, W. S. Yeager.  
Tulane University: W. C. Smith.  
U. S. Military Academy: Lt. Col. C. L. Fenton, Lt. Col. J. L. Devers.  
U. S. Naval Academy: Lt. Com. A. C. McFall, A. K. Snyder.  
University of Arizona: E. L. Larson.  
University of California College of Agriculture: I. F. Toomey.  
University of Chicago: T. N. Metcalf.  
University of Cincinnati: D. M. King.  
University of Colorado: B. F. Oakes.  
University of Delaware: J. F. Daugherty, G. P. Doherty.  
University of Denver: A. C. Nelson.  
University of Georgia: H. J. Stegeman.  
University of Maine: T. S. Curtis.  
University of Maryland: Geary Eppley.  
University of Michigan: R. W. Aigler, F. H. Yost.  
University of Nebraska: D. X. Bible.  
University of New Hampshire: W. H. Cowell, H. C. Swasey.  
University of North Carolina: R. A. Fetzer, O. K. Cornwell.  
University of Notre Dame: J. E. McCarthy.  
University of Pennsylvania: E. L. Mercer, F. W. Luehring, R. T. McKenzie, H. J. Swarts, W. A. Bishop.  
University of Rochester: Edwin Fauver, Walter Campbell, M. D. Lawless, L. A. Alexander.  
University of Southern California: H. C. Willett.  
University of Tennessee: H. W. Dougherty.  
University of Tulsa: J. B. Miller.  
University of Vermont: S. C. Abell, H. A. Prentice, W. L. Gardner, A. T. Post.  
Vanderbilt University: L. C. Glenn.  
Washington University: F. H. Ewerhardt, A. E. Eilers.  
Wesleyan University: Edgar Fauver, F. W. Nicolson, J. F. Martin, Dale Lash, H. G. McCurdy.  
Western State Teachers College: M. J. Gary, J. A. Hyames.  
West Virginia University: C. P. Schott.  
William and Mary College: B. Bockock.  
Williams College: E. A. Locke, J. E. Bullock.  
Worcester Polytechnic Institute: P. R. Carpenter.  
Yale University: Malcolm Farmer.

### II. ALLIED MEMBERS:

Border Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: E. L. Larson.  
Colored Intercollegiate Athletic Association: J. L. Whitehead, C. H. Williams.  
Kansas Collegiate Athletic Conference: W. B. Wilson.  
Mid-West Collegiate Athletic Conference: M. L. Eby.  
Missouri Valley Conference: F. H. Ewerhardt, H. H. King.  
Pacific Coast Intercollegiate Athletic Conference: H. C. Willett.  
Rocky Mountain Faculty Athletic Conference: A. C. Nelson.  
Southern Conference: G. F. Thistlethwaite.

### III. ASSOCIATE MEMBERS:

Phillips Academy, Andover: Oswald Tower.



#### IV. NON-MEMBERS:

Brooklyn College: R. J. O'Neil, F. A. Olesen.  
Colorado College: President Thurston Davies.  
Davidson College: N. W. Shepard.  
Morningside College: J. M. Saunderson.  
Providence College: J. E. Farrell.  
St. John's College: Valentine Lentz.  
State Teachers College, E. Stroudsburg, Pa.: H. A. Lorenz.

#### V. INDIVIDUALS:

L. W. Allen, Hartford, Conn.  
Dr. John Brown, Jr., Y. M. C. A., New York.  
R. H. Colson, Asst. Supervisor, Mass. State Dept. of Education.  
R. C. Cubbon, Y. M. C. A., Brooklyn, N. Y.  
C. H. Edwards, Maine State Director of Physical and Health Education.  
Dr. A. S. Lamb, McGill University, Montreal, Canada.  
Bernard Musnik, American Correspondent of "L'Auto" (Paris).  
C. L. Schrader, Former Mass. State Supervisor of Physical Education.

### THIRTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION

NEW YORK CITY, DECEMBER 27-29, 1936

#### 1936 COUNCIL MEETING

The Council met for dinner and a later business session at 6:30 p. m., December 27, in the Hotel Pennsylvania. There were present the president and the secretary; the vice-presidents of six of the eight districts,—Malcolm Farmer (1st), W. C. Smith (3rd), R. W. Aigler (4th), H. H. King (5th), A. C. Nelson (7th), and H. C. Willett (8th); all the members of the Executive Committee—Messrs. Badger, Berry, Bingham, Mercer, Raycroft, Sackett, and St. John; chairmen of seven rules committees—W. R. Okeson (football), A. I. Prettyman (ice hockey), Hugo Bezdek (boxing), T. N. Metcalf (track), F. W. Luehring (swimming), L. W. St. John (basketball), and J. A. Rockwell, acting for R. G. Clapp (wrestling); chairmen of three special committees—T. E. French (nomination of rules committees), C. M. Updegraff (radio broadcasting of college games), and Z. G. Clevenger (preservation of amateur standards); representatives of nine conferences—E. L. Larson (Border Conference), A. S. Lamb (Canadian), W. B. Wilson (Kansas), C. E. Bilheimer (Middle Atlantic States), A. E. Eilers (Missouri Valley), H. C. Willett (Pacific Coast), A. C. Nelson (Rocky Mountain), R. A. Fetzer (Southern), and G. A. Works (Western); Leslie Mann, representing the U. S. A. Baseball Congress; and the following individuals—E. W. Ewerhardt, Washington University, G. L. Rider and Frank Wilton, Miami University, R. C. Huston, Michigan State College, K. L. Wilson, Northwestern University, I. F. Toomey, California Agricultural College, and George Van Bibber, Conn. State College.

The Council spent several hours in discussion of various matters affecting the interests of the Association. These were all brought before the Convention at its business session, and will be found below in the report of that meeting. The Council listened with pleasure to a brief address by former President General Palmer E. Pierce, now Honorary President.

#### ROUND TABLE CONFERENCES

Two round table conferences were held at this Convention, one on the subject of the eligibility of Junior College graduates



in a senior college, and the second on some of the problems of the small colleges. A verbatim report of these conferences will be found in the Appendix.

### GENERAL SESSION

On Tuesday morning, December 29, the annual public Convention was held. The president of the Association gave his annual address, and three college presidents spoke on the general topic: Are our Intercollegiate Contests to Continue Amateur. The four addresses are printed in full in these Proceedings.

### BUSINESS SESSION

On Tuesday afternoon the usual meeting was held, not open to the public, in which the business of the Association was transacted.

The secretary reported an unusual number of applications for membership, 27 for active and 2 for allied membership. The following were elected: King College, University of North Dakota, University of Miami, Western Reserve University, Ohio Northern University, San Jose State College, University of California College of Agriculture, University of Idaho, Texas Christian University, University of Denver, University of Arizona, Indiana State Teachers College, Canisius College, Ithaca College, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Rollins College, University of South Carolina, Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Wake Forest College, College of William and Mary, Furman University, Mississippi State College, University of Mississippi, Louisiana State University, University of Alabama, University of Kentucky, Cornell College; and to allied membership: Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and the Border Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

The treasurer's report, audited by Dean Sackett, was accepted and adopted, showing a balance carried forward to next year of \$5,667.28. The income of the past year was \$8,280.80 and the expenses \$8,151.87. The report in detail will be found in the Appendix.

Annual reports of the eight district vice-presidents and of the chairmen of rules committees, and also the report of the special committee on Radio Broadcasting of College Games, were presented in printed form, and will be found in later pages of these Proceedings, as also reports of three other special committees, on Eligibility for N. C. A. A. Meets, on Influences inimical to the best Interests of Intercollegiate Sport, and on the Federal Admissions Tax. The first and third of these four special committees were discharged from further service, with thanks.

With reference to eligibility for N. C. A. A. meets it was decided to adhere to the rule already adopted limiting contestants to representatives of active members, but with the understanding that the Council have the power, on request of any rules committee, to admit to a specific meet representatives of allied members (conferences).

As to the place of meeting in 1937 it was agreed to take a mail vote of the member colleges, each to indicate its first, second, and third choice of names of cities to be submitted from which invitations have been received. When the votes are added, the city totalling the smallest number (after the fashion of determining the result of a cross-country race) will be the choice. New York City will not be included in the voting, as the Association plans in general to go elsewhere every five years.

It was voted to appoint four persons to represent the N. C. A. A. to cooperate with the U. S. A. Baseball Congress in establishing the "Olympic Baseball Goal" and the "All American Team", these four to constitute the N. C. A. A. Baseball Committee, not to form playing rules, as the professional rules are satisfactory, but to foster future developments of baseball in the colleges under proper amateur standards.

The dates and places of several N. C. A. A. meets for 1937 were determined, as follows: Wrestling, March 19-20, Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute, Ind.; Swimming, March 26-27, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.; Boxing, April 1-3, College of Agriculture, University of California, Davis, Cal.; Track, June 18-19, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

Two resolutions were adopted by the Convention. The first, offered by a committee consisting of Dr. Raycroft, Mr. Berry, and Mr. Bingham, was as follows:

WHEREAS, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, through its officers and representatives has participated, under the leadership of Avery Brundage, in the selection, organization, financing, and administration of the team which represented America in the Olympic Games of 1936, and

WHEREAS, it has become aware in the course of such participation of the conflicting viewpoints, dissensions, and opposition with which the said Avery Brundage was obliged to cope as Chairman of the American Olympic Committee, and has observed the patience, courage, skill, and self-sacrifice with which he acted in the leadership of this great enterprise,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the National Collegiate Athletic Association record its recognition of the outstanding qualities of resourcefulness and leadership displayed by



Avery Brundage as Chairman of the American Olympic Committee of 1936, and its admiration and respect for him as a man and as an Olympic officer.

The second was offered by Dean Sackett:

RESOLVED, That the National Collegiate Athletic Association express its sincere appreciation of the efficient services performed by many of its members, on committees, in raising funds, and as managers of teams, thus contributing to the success of the 11th Olympic games at Berlin.

Professor T. E. French, for his committee, proposed a list of rules committees, which was adopted. It was voted to apply the principle of rotation next year to the wrestling and swimming rules committees. The names of the committees for 1937 will be found on pages 3-5 of these Proceedings.

Mr. Romeyn Berry proposed for his committee a list of officers. The list was approved by unanimous consent. It appears on page 2.

#### 1937 COUNCIL MEETING

The members of the 1937 Council present at the Convention met after the adjournment of the Convention and elected seven members at large of the Council and seven members of the Executive Committee. These names will be found on page 2. They also appointed the following committee of the N. C. A. A. on the Olympic Games of 1940: Dana X. Bible, University of Nebraska, Romeyn Berry, Cornell University, W. J. Bingham, Harvard University, W. O. Hunter, University of Southern California, Clyde Littlefield, University of Texas, Alfred Masters, Stanford University, L. H. Mahony, University of Denver, Frank McCormick, University of Minnesota, L. W. St. John, Ohio State University, and W. C. Smith, Tulane University, the president of the Association to serve as an *ex-officio* member.

## REPORTS OF DISTRICTS

### FIRST DISTRICT

MALCOLM FARMER, YALE UNIVERSITY

The First District of the N. C. A. A. includes all the states in the New England District. A communication, sent to fifteen athletic directors of colleges and universities in this district, was in the form of a questionnaire covering ten points. The questions and answers were as follows.

1. *Do you operate both Intercollegiate and Intramural athletics?*

Thirteen of the schools operate both intercollegiate and intramural athletics under one department, while in two cases the Department of Physical Education supervises Intramural athletics.

2. *Are Intramural athletics at your College increasing in popularity?*

Fourteen directors report that intramural athletics are increasing in popularity. One university answers in the negative, but qualifies the answer by stating that they reached 100% popularity about twenty years ago and have been maintained on that basis ever since.

3. *Are Intramural athletics taking the place of Intercollegiate sports to any extent?*

In all cases this question was emphatically answered in the negative. At one college the type of student as well as the curriculum makes the intramural activities more desirable for the necessary exercise which these men are urged to participate in.

4. *In what branches of sport do you have Intercollegiate contests?*

Track was the only sport reported by all fifteen of the schools. Baseball, basketball, football and tennis were checked by fourteen schools. Golf by thirteen schools. Cross Country by twelve. Soccer by ten. Swimming by ten. Wrestling by eight. Hockey, Fencing, LaCrosse by seven. Squash Racquets by four. Crew, gym, boxing, rifle, polo and winter sports by three schools.

5. *Have you discontinued any branches of sport during the past twelve months?*

Wrestling was dropped from the athletic curriculum at one school, and basketball was added at another school.



6. *Do your coaches have Faculty rank?*

Seven schools report that they do, while three report that they do not have Faculty rank. At two schools part of the coaching staff are members of the Faculty due to their membership in the Department of Physical Education. Five have some members on their coaching staff on the Faculty.

7. *Are your coaches employed on a full time basis throughout the academic year?*

In the main, the coaches are employed throughout the year, with ten schools reporting definitely yes, and only one no. The balance have about 50% of the coaches employed on a full time basis.

8. *Was attendance at games during the Fall greater or less than last Fall?*

There seems to be a decided increase in attendance, even with adverse weather conditions. Eleven schools report that their attendance was greater; three report their attendance less; one reports no change; one school does not have any sports producing income during the Fall program. Schools with decreased attendance also report a poor season in football.

9. *Do you depend upon athletic revenue, solely, to pay expenses of your athletics?*

Six schools are dependent, solely, upon the athletic revenue for the expenses of their athletic program. The balance of the schools receive part of their revenue by assessing the students in the form of a student tax.

10. *Does the College Administration allocate any funds to athletics?*

Two-thirds of the colleges reporting do allocate funds for the support of athletics.

*Conclusions:*

The Intramural athletic department in the majority of schools in this district are controlled by the Director of Intercollegiate Athletics. Intramural sports have increased in popularity, but have not, in any case, taken the place of intercollegiate sports.

There seems to be a general trend toward making the coaches' position more secure by giving them Faculty rank and employing them on a year around basis.

The increased revenue from football games, and the majority of schools allocating funds from the College Administration to defray part of the athletic expenses have reduced the financial strain on the athletic department. Colleges have maintained their full sports program, except in one instance where wrestling was

discontinued and this was offset by the addition of basketball.

Is recruiting on the increase or decline in this district? In the writer's opinion there seems to be much more talk than ever before, and this alone would lead one to believe that recruiting is decidedly on the increase.

SECOND DISTRICT

DEAN H. DIEDERICH, CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Unable for lack of time to call a conference in the Second District, I tried to obtain a cross-section of opinion on athletic problems by writing to a number of men of my acquaintance in the colleges in the district. A considerable number of answers was received.

It is true, however, to say that no new problems or new viewpoints were presented.

All the correspondents, except one, stated that attendance at Fall sports, particularly football, was greater than it was a year ago. The exception to this proved to be a large university, and in this case the reasons were thought to be bad weather, strong local competition, and broadcasting. The last intimation is interesting in view of the spread of broadcasting and the selling of broadcasting rights. That is again not a new problem and it has been discussed many times. Until a year or two ago sentiment in most colleges was against the practice. Now opinion seems to swing in favor of it.

The second, and greater, problem that each of the correspondents mentioned was, of course, the question of subsidizing. The opinion was unanimous that this evil, to put it mildly, is with us still, and some believe that it is more prevalent than ever before. Some of the writers believe that there is no solution for the difficulty, since it is practically impossible to stop any private person from endowing a boy with a college education, if he desires to do so. Others feel very strongly that each institution can have the kind of athletics that it desires. Much may be done by rigidly upholding the entrance requirements and the scholastic standards, after the student is in the college. Some are inclined to blame the college authorities for laxness in these matters. One correspondent mentioned the difficulty of scheduling games for an entire season with teams above reproach.

Closely related to this is the question of intersectional games. There is grave doubt in the minds of many people that the players on any team travelling clear across the continent in term time can be *bona fide* students, no matter if the rolls show them registered.

Evidently the problems of subsidizing and over-emphasis are



still with us. The opinions of most of the correspondents leaned a little toward the side of hopelessness that these questions would ever be solved. With regard to over-emphasis on intercollegiate sports, many colleges are going in more strongly for intramural sport participation.

### THIRD DISTRICT

DR. WILBUR C. SMITH, TULANE UNIVERSITY

A paradoxical situation, without parallel elsewhere, has arisen in the Third District during the past year.

This district, embracing eleven Southern states and covering two major conferences, has seen two extreme methods put into operation to deal with the problems of subsidization and recruiting of athletes.

Just a little more than a year ago, the Southeastern Conference adopted new and bold measures to meet a situation that admittedly had existed in proselyting and which the members felt to be existing generally in most of the colleges and universities of the country.

In effect, the Southeastern Conference recognized that in virtually all schools, students were being aided by alumni in particular and from other sources in general which was contrary to the letter and spirit of the conference constitution and by-laws.

It was the feeling that the greatest evil in the existing code was the failure to recognize general tendencies, practices, and subterfuge. This conference felt that it was time to cast aside any vestige of hypocrisy and look upon the matter in an impartial light. Frank measures had been proposed and adopted at the executive committee meeting the previous September.

It was therefore no surprise when the Southeastern Conference adopted the following article at its December meeting, 1935:

"Athletic ability should receive consideration in determining student values and in the assignment of scholarships, loans, and opportunities for remunerative work, with the understanding that such assistance shall never be granted primarily as a reward for athletic services, such aid not to exceed in amount the legitimate expense of attending the institution as represented by tuition, fees, books, board, and lodging; and provided further that such assistance be granted by a regular faculty committee and the records of such assistance be open to the inspection of the administrative officers of the institution and the officers of the Southeastern Conference; and provided further that athletes be held to the same scholastic requirements that have been established by the institution for other scholarships.

"All scholarship and loan funds at any member institution for which athletes are eligible must be placed in the hands of the university officer or committee that usually administers such funds.

"Full records shall be kept of the source and distribution of such funds as are awarded or loaned to students participating in intercollegiate athletics."

This plan has now been in effect a year and I am convinced that it has elevated intercollegiate athletics to a higher plane, and in general has corrected the evils and problems which previously had made falsifiers out of many of the athletes who had filled out required forms to the effect that they were not the recipients of aid from any unauthorized source.

Undoubtedly this rule will be tightened as time and experience proves the need, but certainly we feel that it is a wholesome improvement over the idealistic prattle that we had endured for so many years without any attempt to look upon the problem from a practical and material viewpoint.

It was certainly a material problem, and it was felt that it was time that concrete action be applied rather than the perennial passing of resolutions deploring such practices and calling attention to existing constitutional amendments prohibiting such forms of aid.

The other major conference of the Third District, namely the Southern Conference, two months later took a definite stand in the opposite direction, although the close vote disclosed that members of that conference were not wholeheartedly in accord with the plan adopted.

The "Graham Plan," as the Southern Conference action has become generally known, was inspired by high motives and aimed to put athletics on a finer basis.

Sponsored by President Frank Graham, of the University of North Carolina, it specified, among other things, that:

"It has been and is an accepted part of the provisions of all intercollegiate athletic conferences that an athlete may be awarded a scholarship, loan, job, or other financial aid on his merits as a person and student on the same basis as other students, but it is the purpose of this Conference in seeking to carry out the ideals of the National Collegiate Athletic Association to make more explicit and effective its present prohibition of scholarships, loans, jobs, and any other material consideration for athletes as athletes.

"Any student, who, as a consideration for his athletic ability or promise of athletic ability, receives, or is to receive, any preferential consideration in the matter of tuition, fees, room, board, clothes, books, charge account, job, loan, scholarship, or any other financial aid or material consideration whatever, whether provided or to be provided by the institution or any of



its associations, representatives, or agencies, direct or indirect, or any alumnus or group of alumni, or any student or group of students, or any other person or persons interested in the institution or any of its teams, is ineligible to represent the institution in an intercollegiate contest. This regulation does not apply to athletic clothes for practice and games, to the necessary expense or travel for games, to proper medical expenses incident to athletic training and games, and to awards of sweaters and monograms provided by the institution."

The various phases of scholarship awards, jobs, remission of charge, financial aid, or other material consideration are dealt with in a clear and concise method which leaves no question in the application of the above premises.

The "Graham Plan" promises to come in for much consideration and discussion when the Southern Conference representatives gather again.

Forrest Fletcher, President of the Southern Conference, only recently issued a statement in the public press that he would recommend complete abolition of the "Graham Plan" when the conference meets in December. Mr. Fletcher, as quoted in the press, stated that not one of the sixteen conference members had adhered to the spirit of the rules, despite the fact no technical violations had been brought to light.

Dean R. B. House, of the University of North Carolina, promptly replied that his institution, along with its Raleigh branch, North Carolina State, anticipated no recession in its attitude.

In a recent confidential questionnaire, sent to athletic directors of the various Southern Conference institutions, asking if it was felt that conditions had improved, one institution reported that "it is growing steadily worse in all institutions."

Another stated that "there has been no particular change in the Conference up to the present time."

One athletic director stated that he was not prepared to speak for the other institutions, but that it had not affected his institution, stating that his University had always subscribed and lived up to the regulations now in effect.

Another stated: "The Southern Conference should be free of the practices of subsidizing of athletics under the Graham plan. I wonder if this is true?"

Still another states:

"We are assisting boys this year as in the past by giving them work to do around the campus. We have no scholarships and no loan fund to speak of; therefore all boys we assist must do some work for the remuneration they receive. There has never been any reduction of fees to any athlete."

"We have just sent in our eligibility blanks for the season and listed on each the jobs our athletes hold, and also the pay they

receive for same. I have no idea how they will be received by the executive committee, and I am afraid some of the blanks will not meet with the approval of the committee if the Graham plan is enforced to the letter."

I have tried to reflect the athletic situation in the Third District at this time. Perhaps the results of another year will give a better insight into the progress that is being made and the results attained.

Certainly, both the Southern Conference and the Southeastern Conference are sincerely earnest in trying to better conditions and elevate athletics to a higher plane. The gentlemen now in authority will be the first to admit error, if and when they are convinced of it. This is the most satisfying step in the right direction.

I believe that college athletics as a whole will eventually benefit by the bold though paradoxical steps that have been taken in the Third District during the past year.

Certainly neither group showed a fear of criticism in the action taken.

#### FOURTH DISTRICT

PROFESSOR RALPH W. AIGLER, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Responses from member institutions in the Fourth District indicate that the chief problems confronting such members during the current year have been much the same as those that were causing concern during the preceding year. These problems, indeed, seem to resolve themselves in effect into one, namely, the pressure by various people, groups, and interests upon likely-looking athletic material to enroll in a certain college or university. Reports agree that if it were possible for all of the educational institutions of the country to content themselves with athletic teams of the quality that would result from the natural flow of student choice, most, if not all, of the trouble and problems of intercollegiate athletics would automatically disappear.

It is frequently pointed out that a very few institutions set the pace for the entire country. In other words, the ruthless and unethical tactics of a small number of institutions create a situation that drives most of the others, more or less as a measure of self-defense, to indulge in some of the practices which otherwise they would disdain to pursue. If it be suggested that this attitude is one to be condemned, a partial answer is that among people generally the disposition to "keep up with the Joneses" is pretty deeply rooted.

The foregoing statement must not be interpreted as anything like a confession that all the member institutions in the Fourth



District are indulging in high pressure recruiting and subsidizing. The truth is that at most of the institutions in the district these reprehensible practices are not only discountenanced but held to a minimum. The influence of the few is such, however, that eternal vigilance and courage on the part of those who wish to keep intercollegiate athletics in its proper position in an educational institution are necessary.

Emphasis has been given to the obvious fact that within the last year or two there has developed a tendency stronger than ever before to picture intercollegiate athletics before the public at large as essentially, if not solely, a business and amusement enterprise. Articles and stories picturing intercollegiate teams as made up of hirelings rather than of typical college students have been distressingly common. All too many people fail to realize that at most of our American colleges and universities the intercollegiate athletic program is an integral part of the institution's work in physical education and that the intercollegiate teams are after all fair cross-sections of the male student bodies. A large number of athletes, to be sure, seem to be drawn from those families that find it impossible to send a boy or a girl to college without the boy or girl earning at least part of the necessary expenses, and to many unthinking people many an athlete who holds a job, perhaps thereby earning no more than his board or room, must necessarily be listed as subsidized. The unfortunate report by the Carnegie Foundation of several years ago did much to fix this idea. It is to be hoped that if the Foundation is to make another study of conditions in intercollegiate athletics, it will have learned the supreme importance of making a differentiation between honest employment on the one side, and mere support, as subsidies, on the other.

It is a very general opinion among the members of the Fourth District that in a large measure the control of these evils lies within the institutions themselves. If entrance requirements are set at a proper point and administered without favor because of athletic reputation, if each candidate for an athletic team must have spent not only one year in residence, but have completed satisfactorily one full year of college work (the kind of work that will be acceptable for the degree for which he is a candidate), if candidates for teams are required to have scholarship records that are clear, indicating that they are truly college students in good standing, likely to go on and receive the degree of the institution in which they are enrolled—if all these things are demanded as a requisite for eligibility, it is the firm belief of many close observers that most of the problems of recruiting and subsidization will almost automatically disappear. In other words, the offensive recruiter and subsidizer needs a measure of co-operation on the part of the affected institution, if his results are to appear on the scoreboard.

All this naturally means that the control of intercollegiate athletics must be vested in that agency of the university that controls its educational policies, namely, the Faculty. This requisite has for decades been the primary requirement for membership in the so-called Western Conference. That that body deeply feels the importance of the preservation of full and complete Faculty control is shown by one troublesome situation that came before the Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives during the past year.

Various bits of evidence indicated that at one of the ten institutions making up the group, Faculty control had been superseded by a control by the governing body. Although the Conference fully recognized that even the Faculty are subject to the direction of the governing body, it felt that it was important to insist that even Boards of Regents and Trustees must become accustomed to the general acceptance of Faculty recommendations regarding matters of intercollegiate athletics. The institution in question was suspended, to take effect at a date in the future, unless in the meantime such steps had been taken at that institution as would warrant the Faculty thereof making a statement to the Conference that it considered itself in full and complete control. It is a matter of no little gratification that within two months the Faculty of that university felt warranted in giving such assurance to the Conference.

It is with regret that announcement is made in this permanent form of the passing of a figure who for many years was a bulwark for clean and wholesome athletics. Mr. George Huff, of the University of Illinois, was beloved not only by Illinois students, Faculty, and alumni but also by all those with whom he has had any contacts. His death is a big loss to the Fourth District.

Members of the district were asked to express their judgment as to the Olympic situation. The replies have not been sufficiently numerous or explicit to warrant any definite statement. It may be said, however, that there is a very general criticism of the Olympic management. Not infrequently it has been suggested that some way must be found to bring the management of the American Olympic teams more closely into accord with the ideals of American college athletics; that if this cannot be accomplished, it would be better to forget about the Olympics.

#### FIFTH DISTRICT

PROFESSOR H. H. KING, KANSAS STATE COLLEGE

#### *Attendance.*

Football receipts in this district were greater the past fall than they have been for several years. The largest total attendance



reported was at the University of Nebraska. This institution filled its stadium to capacity in nearly every game played there. Practically all institutions shared in the general financial improvement.

#### *Injuries.*

Last year we mentioned an unusually large number of injuries reported by the press. The 1936 season appears to have been much freer of injuries. Naturally there were some, but they did not appear so severe as did so many of those occurring in the 1935 season. One cannot but wonder if the changes in the rules did not have something to do with this lessening in the number injured.

#### *Subsidizing and Recruiting of Athletes.*

This district is made up of conferences of widely different types. We have conferences composed of Junior Colleges, those composed of small denomination colleges, and those made up of our larger state institutions. While these conferences may in the main play under the same general code, there is nevertheless a big difference in the manner and extent to which they follow certain specific points brought out in the N. C. A. A. code published some two years ago. We have institutions striving to follow the code in much detail, whilst there are others which show no pronounced tendency to abide by the details. As an example, I would cite the matter of contacting potential college athletes. Many schools are making overtures to high school students and not waiting for the students to come first to them. It is not an exaggeration of the truth to state that more of this is being done in this district by colleges from outside the district than by those within it. The policy of running down the outstanding high school athlete has become much more pronounced since certain institutions have begun to make contacts openly with the students.

It would appear that the number of cases of recruiting has been larger than at any time for many years past. This is no doubt occasioned by the fact that the recruited athlete may in some institutions be openly subsidized.

#### *Junior College Question.*

The question relating to the time at which a Junior College graduate becomes eligible for participation after enrolling in a senior college is still an open one in this district. Most of the conferences composed of the smaller institutions permit a Junior College graduate to begin participation immediately upon enrolling. Of the two conferences composed of the largest schools in the district one is opposed to such participation, and the other is somewhat on the fence and is withholding its final action until

after the annual meeting of the N. C. A. A. In this latter conference some schools are trying out the policy of immediate participation, while others in the conference have not availed themselves of this privilege.

The question of how much competition is to be permitted in the senior college to the Junior College student who has already played two years has not been definitely and uniformly settled.

#### SIXTH DISTRICT

PROFESSOR E. W. MCDIARMID, TEXAS CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY

The Sixth District comprises such a large area that district meetings are infrequently called. The last one, held in Dallas, Texas, two years ago, seemed to convince most of those present that another meeting of the kind would not be desirable for about a decade at least. And this not because of the good accomplished! Accordingly this report is hardly more than an individual account of certain matters which have been on the writer's mind and which have been the subject of some correspondence with leaders in the district.

As a result of part of this correspondence a meeting of the Commission on Athletics of the Association of Texas Colleges is to be held on December 11. The chief subjects to be considered are: (1) Freshman eligibility for varsity squads, an ancient evil to which a very few colleges have returned, perhaps as a result of the depression; (2) subsidization of athletes. (About this, the writer will have nothing more to say in this report, for the reason that he knows not what to say. Who does? Is not this a problem too big for any Conference or for any District? Not even the New Dealers can help us here); (3) the status of Junior College athletes transferring to standard colleges. There is being considered the plan of counting the Junior College from which an athlete transfers as part and parcel of the standard college to which he transfers, so far as estimating eligibility to participate is concerned. The Junior College graduate, according to the plan proposed, will have the privilege of immediate participation upon entering the Senior College. The non-graduate will have a year of residence to complete before his eligibility is established. In either case, the Junior College athlete will be charged with whatever participation he may have had in his freshman or sophomore year in the Junior College, making his case analogous to a standard college freshman or sophomore with the same record of participation in those years. This will obviate, among other malpractices, the absurdity of allowing a Junior College graduate upon entering a Southwest Athletic Conference institution the privilege of participation in his first year as a freshman and then



the privilege of participating for three more years on the varsity. This is the very generous policy which has prevailed for many years among us.

We are returning to normalcy in the matter of football schedules; beginning with next season our schedules in the Southwest Athletic Conference will be limited to ten games.

It has been demonstrated that a vigorous effort to stamp out drinking in our stadia produces satisfactory results. Constant vigilance is necessary, however. It is hoped that the start which has been made will be continued in the years to come, so that our stands will be entirely clear of drunken rowdies.

The Southwest is proud of the officials who operate in the Sixth District. These officials are well organized and coached for their work. They are being called upon more and more to work in other districts. Despite their efficiency, they are occasionally the victims of severe and unfair criticism on the part of certain scribes. An appeal will be issued to the press to present criticism through the proper channels and to put an end to the practice of dragooning officials in the sport columns. All in all, any report from this district must be written on the favorable side of the ledger.

#### SEVENTH DISTRICT

DR. A. C. NELSON, UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

The progress of intercollegiate athletics in this district during the past year has seen no developments of outstanding significance. The geographical influence in this region tends to reduce the intensity of athletic interests, because of the fact that there are very few large centers of population compared to the situation in other regions in the United States. This has resulted in a time-lag always being evident with respect to the development of athletic interests in this district. I am quite convinced that the popularity of football and basketball has not yet reached a point comparable to that in other districts. Whatever effect may be felt in other districts from the emphasis upon professional football, for example, has not yet entered the picture in this territory. There is a pronounced development in basketball among the groups sponsoring teams for A. A. U. and similar competition. There is also a definite increase in the interest in basketball among the colleges. I am not certain as to whether the interest in non-collegiate basketball has detracted from or increased the interest in collegiate basketball. The fact that the National A. A. U. basketball tournament has been held in Denver twice during the last few years, and it appears to be scheduled for Denver again this year, has played some part in this development.

Many of the college teams have supplemented their intercollegiate play by participating in the A. A. U. tournaments. No matter what factors contributed, the institutions in the region definitely report an increased participation on the part of students and also an increase in the attendance at intercollegiate contests in basketball.

The situation with respect to football during the current year shows no particular change from preceding years. There is some evidence that the attendance at football contests has been somewhat greater than in previous years. Although weather conditions have reduced attendance in some instances, the trend of interest in football, as evidenced from total attendance figures, seems to be still in the upward direction. At some schools admission prices to football games have been slightly increased. This has not affected attendance. I think it is safe to assume that the quality of the competition afforded by many of the institutions in this region is also considerably improved. One of the things which concerns the coaching and managerial staffs of institutions in this region is the difficulty of gaining for their outstanding players national recognition. In general, the feeling on the part of many in other localities that the Rocky Mountain region is a great distance away has made it difficult to secure intersectional relationships, which seems to be the only way by which institutions can gain national recognition athletically. It is, of course, evident that, from an educational or academic point of view, collegiate institutions should not be concerned with recognition of their athletic teams in a national way. It is equally true, however, that the public interest and all the other factors in collegiate athletics today make the element of recognition, both for the teams of the institution as a whole and for the individual players, a most vital consideration in the life of those who are responsible for the coaching and managerial functions. As long as there still prevails the attitude which makes a college coach feel that very frequently one point in a game or one game in a season is all that stands between him and the "wolves", it must be admitted that those responsible for the academic point of view in collegiate athletics cannot neglect the importance of the place which the athletic program of an institution has in the life of the community and in the standing which the institution receives among its contemporaries, both locally and nationally.

An illustration of the difficulty of consolidating these two lines of approach in the conduct of intercollegiate athletics, that is, the purely academic approach and the managerial approach, has been demonstrated within the last month. For many years the Rocky Mountain Faculty Athletic Conference has been a twelve school conference, with six of these schools situated very close to Denver, the largest center of population in the region. Three of the conference schools are very close to Salt Lake City, the next



largest center of population. The University of Wyoming is located about midway between these two centers of population. Montana State College is more or less alone in the extreme northern section of the conference territory. Western State College of Colorado is inconveniently situated in the heart of the mountains in western Colorado, not easily accessible to either the other Colorado institutions or those in Utah. The total registration in these institutions varies from about 3000 to 500. The geographical factor and the differences in the size of student bodies very frequently created difficulties in the relations between institutions from the standpoint of schedules, equality of competitive ability, and the financial aspects of games, particularly with respect to the expense of traveling. It has been admitted that the elements of distance, size of institution, etc. need have no particular effect upon the determination of the fundamental principles with respect to eligibility of players, ethics of institutional relationships, and other academic considerations. I personally feel that the question of general standards of conference relationships, so far as the academic bases for participation and the general conduct of collegiate athletics are concerned, need in no way have any bearing upon the number of institutions in a conference alignment. From this standpoint twelve schools or twenty-five schools can come together for mutual considerations of their problems. On the other hand, when it comes to the matter of preparing schedules, of administering competitive relationships, and other managerial necessities, the element of geographical disparity, and inequalities of competitive strength created difficulties which are often impossible to surmount. The result of this situation in the Rocky Mountain Conference has led to a recent proposal by seven of the larger institutions to withdraw from the present conference alignment and a more easily administered organization has been created.

It would seem that intercollegiate institutions have not yet been able to find a way to apply academic ideals and the educational purposes of an athletic program to its financial and public relations aspects in such a manner as to make an ideal combination of these two rather widely divergent considerations. It is my conviction that the whole problem of recruiting and subsidizing grows out of the recognized importance of the public relations aspect of intercollegiate athletics and the fact that no satisfactory method has yet been devised for bridging the gap between this phase of our athletic program and the educational aspect of athletics and physical education in our colleges.

An examination of the various sports included in the intercollegiate programs of many of the institutions of this area shows that the number of sports varies from three to nine. Football, basketball, and track are included in all institutions. Other sports included baseball, swimming, golf, tennis, gymnastics, and

wrestling. Interest in baseball seems to have increased to some extent. The same is true of the interest in track activities. If anything, the trend among institutions is to increase rather than decrease the sports program. This is particularly true in the intramural program. Only one institution includes football in its intramural activities, but a number of the institutions report touch-football as one of the intramural sports. Golf, wrestling, tennis, volleyball, boxing, table-tennis, horseshoes, hockey, swimming, soccer, cross-country, free throwing, baseball, track, tumbling, handball, fencing, basketball, riflery, gymnastics, and softball are included by one or more of the institutions in their intramural sports program. There has been a pronounced increase in the interest in softball as a recreational sport in the various public parks and playgrounds in Colorado. To what extent this interest has spread to other parts of this district I am not sure. Its popularity, however, seems to be quite widespread, attracting large crowds of spectators, and may have some influence in the future from the intercollegiate standpoint. Institutions generally report a very pronounced increase in the number of students participating in intramural activities.

It seems desirable to mention the question of the financing of intercollegiate athletics. There seems to be about an equal distribution between the number of institutions in which the athletic program is entirely self-supporting and the number of institutions in which a part of the support comes from general college funds. A number of persons have indicated that there seems to be a trend in their institution toward making the athletic program more self-supporting rather than less self-supporting. It appears that such a trend if it becomes general would accentuate some of the problems referred to above. It occurs to me that, if anything, the trend ought to be in the direction of making the support of athletics a much more integral part of the institutional financial program.

I have sought data on which I could make some comment in this report concerning the trend in the matter of recruiting and subsidizing in this region. The general opinion seems to be that the larger schools are emphasizing athletics too greatly, which in turn makes the pressure felt by smaller schools. At the same time there is a disposition to feel that this region has not yet reached the same stage of over-emphasis of athletics and the activities of recruiting and subsidizing that seems to exist in other regions. This is no attempt on the part of those in the Seventh District to place themselves on a higher plane than anyone else. It is probably more a case of the wave not having reached the same proportions here at the present time as elsewhere. There is a disposition to feel that the pressure is becoming greater in basketball, and to some extent also in track activities. A number report that students interested in athletics are



themselves demanding greater favors than heretofore. There seems to be the threat in this region that if students cannot secure these favors here they will go elsewhere to get them. An interesting situation seems to exist in some institutions which would tend to throw some light upon the question of students demanding greater favors because of their ability in athletics. This is the fact that in some institutions more students interested in athletics have failed to return than heretofore. Either the students are trying to force institutions to grant favors by not returning unless the favors are received, or there is a greater attraction in other fields, either athletic or otherwise. One individual suggested that many students no longer display "the spirit of sacrificing everything for a college education and for the right to represent the college on the football team". There is even some evidence to indicate that high schools are beginning to make attractive offers for the purpose of recruiting athletic teams, particularly in football. This seems not to be very widespread, but is a part of the under-current which one senses occasionally when athletics are being discussed.

There have been one or two cases of additions to the physical equipment for athletic purposes. The University of Colorado is just completing a field house undertaken with the aid of Federal funds. Utah State College and Brigham Young University are in the process of enlarging the dressing rooms and other facilities, supplementing the present stadium equipment. New baseball fields have been added at two institutions. The University of Utah has recently announced a rather extensive plan for increasing its athletic plant. There have been no changes with respect to additions or decreases in the physical education and athletic department staffs. Incidentally, I am inclined to believe that in proportion to the number of schools in the district, this region has more institutions than usual in which coaches and athletic directors have served their institution for an extensive period. In one case a coach and athletic director has had a twenty-six year period of service. Service over a period of from ten to fifteen years characterizes the situation in two or three other instances. This, it seems to me, makes for a more wholesome situation and develops a greater degree of understanding and coördination of the athletic program of an institution with all the other institutional activities, and puts further in the background the common notion that tenure of a coach or athletic director is determined by the ebb and flow of championship teams and public favor. Only security of tenure can give those responsible for intercollegiate athletics the degree of independence necessary to be free from the urge to build teams out of subsidized and recruited material. In conclusion, let me say that, in my judgment, when a coach is judged by the quality of his teaching and his influence on students during practice hours

rather than by the evaluation made by a fickle public based on a demonstration once each week of how much the boys have learned, he will then be in a position comparable to that of the academic instructor whose tenure is not determined merely by whether or not certain students are unable to pass his courses. This is the thing the friends of intercollegiate athletics owe to those who are given the responsibility of carrying out the athletic programs of our institutions.

#### EIGHTH DISTRICT

PROFESSOR H. C. WILLETT, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

The larger part of this year's report from the Eighth District might almost be written by placing ditto marks under the report for 1935. No developments of a serious nature have taken place during the past twelve months. On the other hand, the whole district seems to have devoted itself to the gradual readjustments of both institutional and conference programs made possible by the lessening of the pressure of the late but not lamented depression. A majority of the colleges report a broadening of athletic interests as evidenced by a lessened football hysteria, without any apparent loss of real interest or support, and an increased participation in other sports, particularly of the intramural type.

Conference lines within the district have undergone some adjustment. Two major reasons for these realignments have been given. One reason involves the unequal yoking of private and state colleges, the private colleges finding it difficult to compete against tax supported institutions with lower entrance and scholastic requirements. The other reason involves practical considerations of schedule making. None of these realignments, however, has been of general importance.

In another connection a report will be made on the recruiting and subsidizing of college athletes in the Eighth District. Two or three generalizations, however, may be in order here. It is generally agreed throughout the district that the condition is no worse than it has been in past recent years. There is apparently an honest difference of opinion as to what is legitimate and what is illegitimate in the recruiting of athletes and their support. Amongst the institutions prominent in athletics there is a feeling that the N. C. A. A. code adopted two years ago is unnecessarily vague, impracticable in many respects, and undesirable in one or two of its implications.

The Pacific Coast has shared with other parts of the country in a most interesting football season. A round robin schedule involving eight of the ten Pacific Coast Conference teams has raised the general level of Conference competition and has in-



creased public interest. The upsetting of favored teams by humbler opponents was of somewhat frequent occurrence during the season. No major team of the coast survived the season without defeat. The University of Washington had the best record, bowing only to Minnesota in an early season game and being tied once in its Conference competition. This team was selected by the Conference to be its representative in the Rose Bowl on New Year's day. In this connection it may not be out of place to say that the Pacific Coast Conference now controls the Rose Bowl game. There is no attempt to bill the game as a championship affair. In fact, there is no recognized Pacific Coast championship in football. The team invited to represent the Pacific Coast is selected by vote of the ten Conference members, and the selected team invites its opponent. Emphasis has shifted from championship considerations to the staging of a contest in which the intercollegiate ideals of interesting play, institutional friendship, and intersectional goodwill shall be paramount.

The round robin schedule of the Pacific Coast Conference automatically excluded from some schedules a number of independent schools. For a time this disturbed the otherwise calm waters of intercollegiate football, but the disturbance has apparently subsided. The independent teams have found worthy new opponents and have competed on even terms with Conference teams, both in the excellence of their play and in their command of public support.

In previous reports reference has been made to the rise of professional football in the Eighth District. In the southern section of the district the activities of several local professional teams have been pooled in a concerted effort to secure for one of the clubs a franchise in a national league. Intercollegiate and professional football seem to have reached an unspoken and unwritten agreement that each shall go its own way independent of the other. There is no active opposition to professional football on the part of the colleges, although the major colleges on the Pacific Coast will not permit their coaches or those who officiate in their games to have any connection whatsoever with the professional sport, either as coaches, players, or officials. So long as professional football confines its major activities to the winter months after the close of the intercollegiate season, there seems to be no good reason to anticipate any serious problems such as loomed on the horizon a few years ago.

Interest in track and field sports has always been at a high level in the district. The colleges of the Pacific Coast furnished their fair share of athletes for the last Olympic Games. Prospects for the coming season are unusually good, due in a measure to the scheduling of intersectional meets, the revival of the Pacific Coast meet, and the coming of the N. C. A. A. championships to the coast.

In basketball the southern half of the district will continue to experiment with the elimination of the center jump for placing the ball in play after baskets have been scored. The elimination of the center jump has proved to be very popular not only with the players themselves, but also with the general run of spectators.

In connection with Rugby football, which is played to a considerable extent in California colleges, a study was made during the past year of injuries resulting from the game. The number and the seriousness of the injuries seemed to be quite out of proportion to the number of institutions and students engaged in the sport. The study will be continued during the current winter season of Rugby, and an attempt will be made to lessen the number of serious injuries by a closer supervision of the sport and the men engaged in it.

On the whole, a report from the district must record an encouraging return to normal athletic conditions, financial and otherwise, and a generally healthy condition of all intercollegiate sports. Prophecies concerning the welfare of intercollegiate athletics for the coming year are decidedly tinged with optimism.

## REPORTS OF RULES COMMITTEES

### ASSOCIATION FOOTBALL (SOCCER)

The annual meeting of the N. C. A. A. Association Football Rules Committee was held at the New York Harvard Club on Sunday, January 19, 1936, at 11 A. M.

There were present Douglas Stewart, Pennsylvania, and H. W. Clark, of Lafayette College. The Advisory Committee was represented by James Gentle of Haverford, and A. W. Marsh of Amherst was represented by proxy. Mr. John T. Doyle, Editor, of the American Sports Publishing Company, attended for part of the meeting.

The committee discussed the question of charging goalies. It was reported that this resulted in an injury to at least one player in a college game this fall. It was felt that, even at the risk of an occasional injury, the rules should not be changed drastically, as it would involve too much of a change in the fundamental nature of soccer. The committee felt some action should be taken, and made the present definition of charging more definite by deleting the word "usually" in Note 24, page 91, of the 1935 Rules Book. The last three sentences of the note now read as follows:



"A player who leaves the ground with his both feet, or throws his weight against an opponent, is guilty of jumping at an opponent. Charging with the shoulder and one foot on the ground is a fair charge. Charging with the hip is violent and dangerous."

The International Board has changed Law 7 to read as follows: "It shall be kicked direct into play beyond the penalty area by any one of the players behind whose goal-line it went." This means that on a goal kick it is no longer permissible for any player to kick the ball to the goal-tender, who in turn picks it up and punts it down the field.

Secondly, the Board has decided that "punishment for kicking or attempting to kick the ball when it is held by the goal-keeper is a free kick from which a goal cannot be scored direct."

This is in line with our own efforts to protect the goalie.

The Committee decided to leave the experiment with a more liberal throw-in in abeyance for another year.

The question of a valved ball was discussed, and action will be taken this coming year.

The committee urged the use of the Rules Book by players as well as coaches, and is listing an All-American team in future years.

Efforts were made to have a soccer team representing this country in the Olympics, made up of graduates or undergraduates of the college teams and, hence, more amateur than in past Olympic games. But the committee could not secure coöperation from the authorities governing Olympic soccer.

The various sections of the country were canvassed as to the progress of the sport this fall season, and increased interest in the game has been found in all directions. The New England League, the championship of which was won by Brown, is especially successful, and the Middle Atlantic colleges have organized another league within their group. The outstanding teams in the East were West Chester Teachers College, Syracuse, Penn State, Princeton, Brown, and Swarthmore.

H. W. CLARK,  
*Chairman.*

## BASKETBALL

The National Collegiate Basketball Rules Committee held its annual meeting in New York as a part of the reorganized committee of the United States and Canada. There did not seem to be a mutually satisfactory basis for continuing the association with the A. A. U. and the Y. M. C. A. These two organizations,

therefore, refused to go along with the National Collegiate and the National Federation of State High School Athletic Associations in the reorganization on the basis proposed by the college and high school group.

The present Basketball Rules Committee, therefore, consists of representatives of the N. C. A. A., the National High School Federation, the Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union, and the Canadian Amateur Basketball Association. The rules as promulgated for 1936-37 are therefore sponsored by these groups.

Because of the long association, the pleasant and valuable relationships that have existed in an individual way, this National Basketball Committee added to its Honorary Life Members the names of George T. Hepbron, A. E. Metsdorf, and Dr. John Brown, Jr.

No changes of any great importance were made in the playing code. It is hoped that rules governing our basketball game are reaching the stage where they may remain fixed for a long period of time. We may not have completely reached this stage because it is recognized that a game as young as the game of basketball must of necessity undergo some changes. The principle is universally agreed to, however, that there should be as little changing in the basketball rules as is consistent with the best interests of the game.

L. W. ST. JOHN,  
*Chairman.*

## BOXING

### *Meetings.*

The Committee held five meetings during the past year; one on December 27, 1935, at the Hotel Pennsylvania, New York City, and four during the N. C. A. A. Olympic Boxing Championship Tournament at Charlottesville, Va., on March 26, 27, and 28, 1936. Detailed reports of these meetings have been submitted to Secretary F. W. Nicolson.

### *Rules.*

Owing to discrepancies in interpretation of various rules, the Committee at its meetings changed and added to these rules in order to clarify them. On the whole the Committee feels that with these new changes there will be fewer difficulties in their application during the coming winter season.

### *Publication.*

The Committee is very happy to announce that the American Sports Publishing Company, with material assistance from Mr.



Hugh Riley of Pennsylvania State College, published the N. C. A. A. Boxing Guide. It was very well received and commented upon favorably by the colleges throughout the country. This publication will be continued, with such changes and additions as circumstances dictate.

#### *Tournaments.*

The Committee is glad to report an increased number of tournaments held throughout the country. Two large tournaments were held in the East, one in the Southern Conference, and one on the Pacific Coast. An increased number of requests have been received for information concerning the organization and administration of boxing at institutions. Furthermore, more inquiries this year than before were made concerning the entrance requirements for the various tournaments.

The N. C. A. A. Olympic Tournament was held at Charlottesville, Va., on March 26, 27, and 28, 1936. Entries to the tournament were restricted to membership colleges of the N. C. A. A. The tournament proved a great success. It was efficiently handled, and all participants, officials, and the members of the Committee were satisfied with the results and the manner in which the tournament was conducted. Financially, the tournament broke about even.

The Committee passed a resolution awarding the N. C. A. A. Boxing Tournament to the University of California, College of Agriculture, Davis, California, providing it can be held at an appropriate time so as to allow the various institutions to attend. If not, the University of Wisconsin was selected as the alternate place at which to hold this tournament. A written request for permission to hold this tournament was forwarded to the President and Secretary of the N. C. A. A. A report as to the probabilities of holding it at the University of California, College of Agriculture, Davis, California, will be submitted at the meeting of the Committee in New York City, Monday, December 28, 1936.

#### *Miscellaneous.*

The Committee passed a resolution embodying the suggestion that a budget be allowed for the traveling expenses, meals, and hotel accommodations, for each member of the Committee to attend one annual meeting. This budget would be subsidized by the Southern Conference to the extent of \$200, and by the Eastern Intercollegiate Boxing Association for a similar amount. The Eastern Boxing League is expected also to make a substantial contribution. The total subsidies of approximately \$500 would meet the expense requirements of this one meeting.

HUGO BEZDEK,  
*Chairman.*

## FENCING

The Committee met on December 2 at the Fencers Club, New York, to consider a change in the target for foil fencing and to discuss the effects of the new regulations enacted at the last meeting.

#### *Changes in Rules.*

The rule defining the foil target (Section III, D, 2 of the I. C. F. A. Handbook) was modified to provide an increase in the target as follows:

"The target extends from the top of the collar to the groin lines (in the back to a horizontal line passing across the tops of the hip bones), exclusive of the arms up to the shoulders (the seams of the jackets being made to correspond to the attachment lines of the arms to the shoulders). However, touches on the head, the arms, the hands, or the legs below the groin lines shall be considered valid whenever the head, an arm, a hand, or a leg is placed either intentionally or unintentionally between the target and the point of the opponent, that is,

(a) When the fencer covers, permanently or temporarily, the target, thus protecting it, with his head or one of his arms or legs.

(b) When, by a displacement of the target, the fencer receives on one of these parts, normally invalid, a touch which without such displacement would have reached the target, even though the movement be perfectly regular in itself, for he has substituted for the target an invalid part."

#### *Discussion of Rules.*

With the above change in the foil target definition, the fencing regulations of the Committee and those of the Intercollegiate Fencing Association become identical. The regulations of the two groups differ from those of the national amateur body, the Amateur Fencers League of America, with respect to the ground rules. The new rules were adopted by the Committee after it had had opportunity to observe the marked improvement the changes occasioned at the last I. C. F. A. Championships, which were held in March at the Biltmore Hotel. The A. F. L. A., although viewing the modifications with evident favor, are loath to adopt them, however, pending action by the international body which is now considering them.



The effect of the new ground rules is to speed the game considerably, because all interruptions for ground warnings by officials are eliminated and the entire burden of checking the ground position on the strip is placed on the combatants. As a result, the play has a tendency to confine itself near the center of the strip as the contestants strive more tenaciously to hold their ground. This seems to have an improving influence both on the wrist work and on the timing.

#### *Recommendation.*

The I. C. F. A. Championships held on the 26th and 27th of last March gave a graphic indication of the fact that college fencing was entering a period of truly astonishing growth. This was shown not only by the marked increase in attendance but also by the presence among the spectators of fencers and athletic representatives from many eastern and southern universities not participating in the I. C. F. A. It is obvious that the sport has reached a point where, in the best interest of the game, it is necessary to consider the development of intercollegiate fencing and intercollegiate championships in the many colleges which do not participate in fencing associations. Closer cooperation between the N. C. A. A. and such fencing associations as the I. C. F. A. and others should provide a means of solving this need.

H. ALESSANDRONI,  
*Chairman.*

#### FOOTBALL

We have just finished what was perhaps the most exciting and colorful football season in the history of the game. The great majority of games were real contests and each Saturday became a day of upsets. High-class football was the rule and not the exception. There were few "stand-out" teams, but on the other hand almost every team had one or more glorious victories to its credit. In short, on the surface at least, football's future was never more promising.

Yet it is well to remember that when you have a highly complicated mechanism it requires careful handling. No matter how smoothly it appears to be running it does not take much in the way of a monkey wrench to start the gears clashing. So whether the suggestions for rules changes be few or many, your Committee will make none without careful thought and due consideration of the effect any suggested change may have on the smooth and *safe* operation of the game.

#### *Safety First*

I emphasize the word "safe" in the last sentence because your Committee conceives it to be its primary duty to care for the safety of the players insofar as that is possible in a body-contact game. The rules as now framed offer much protection not afforded before the 1932 changes. More important than the rules is the greatly improved technique of coaches, team physicians, and trainers in handling and caring for the players in practice sessions as well as in the games. The report on the season's accidents and casualties has not been made as I write this, but I will be surprised if the record in college football does not show another advance. Certainly reports from the members of the Rules Committee indicate that, in all parts of the country, the accident list is decreasing.

#### *Proposed Changes*

A canvass of the membership of the Committee shows that the rules this year have been very satisfactory. There have never been so few interpretations necessary, and there has been a dearth of so-called "knotty questions". Of course, as always, when some rule or penalty has an effect on the outcome of an important game there is a demand for a change. Sometimes it is easier to demand a change than it is to frame a satisfactory one. For instance in the East penalties for pass interference having had a direct bearing on the result of several important games, all kinds of suggestions for changing the rule, or at least the penalty, have been made. Some suggest the elimination of the interference penalty entirely and letting the pass receivers take care of themselves as best they can. It would seem that any such change would practically eliminate forward passing, after thirty years of hard and difficult work in framing and reframing rules so as to make this a vital part of the game. If the receivers (there are only five, and everyone knows who they are) are not protected against interference, they would be cut down before they got many steps beyond the line of scrimmage. So that suggestion seems impossible. Others would change the penalty for interference by the defense from loss of the ball at the spot of the foul to a penalty of 15 yards from the spot the ball was put in play. Perhaps this might help. Of course interference on short passes would give the offense more than they deserve at times but this is of small consequence. What is of more importance is that on long passes where completion is attempted near or over the goal line the offense would often lose a well deserved touchdown, because if the defensive player could not reach the ball but could reach the receiver the temptation to cut the receiver down would be too great to resist. Also this 15-yard penalty would sometimes be more severe than the present penalty.



For instance, in the case of the pass interference called on the 3-yard line in the Army-Navy game, this 15-yard penalty would have put the ball on the one-yard line. Noting this, some people have suggested that for pass interference near the goal line or in the end zone the penalty should never put the ball closer than the 5-yard line. This would mean that if a team was on or inside its opponent's 5-yard line and tossed a pass into the end zone the defense would gain by committing a foul and the receiver would be lucky if he hit the ground inside the stadium.

I have gone to some length in speaking of this particular play in order to show how carefully your Committee must consider the various suggestions. In every case we must think the thing through to its ultimate conclusion. This means that we must also consider just how any change should be worded in order that it be not misunderstood, and in addition we must check, and, if necessary, change every other rule that is affected. So we are asking that everyone suggesting a change include with his suggestion the wording to be used and tabulate each rule affected by his suggested change, indicating just how the wording of these affected rules (together with Supplemental Notes and Approved Rulings) is to be changed. It is hardly fair to ask the Committee to do this for a hundred different suggestions. Instead of three days our meeting would have to continue for a month. I am inclined to think if each suggester is obliged to do the work entailed by his suggestion the demand for changes will lose most of its zest.

All of this does not mean that your Committee, noting the happenings in the game in each of the districts into which you have divided the country, will not carefully consider any change which seems vital, and adopt anything which appears to be an improvement. I do want to point out, however, that we have developed a wonderful game, and must watch our step to avoid making changes which will lead to injury of players or upset the balance of the game.

#### *Offense Gaining on Defense*

Speaking of balance, the offense seems to be steadily gaining on the defense, and this would be even more apparent if it were not for the careful scouting systems now in vogue at most colleges. This gain by the offense has made the game more interesting and it does not need any correction. I realize that the Associated Press had published a table showing that the scoring has fallen off steadily since 1922. This is readily explained by two facts. First, the schedules of the larger colleges have been getting stiffer each year and now have few "set-ups" on them. Second, the smaller colleges, because of better coaching and better material, the latter due largely to improved coaching in the high

schools, are now more nearly on a par with the larger schools. Therefore the number of top-heavy scores has decreased, thus pulling down the totals for the season. There are still plenty of games where the outcome is a scoreless tie, but free scoring by both teams is on the increase. This is a healthy sign.

#### *Officiating*

Reports from all over the country indicate that the officiating during the past season was excellent. I do not mean that there was no poor officiating or that no mistakes were made by officials. Far from it, but we must remember that unless football is played in Heaven no one of us will ever see a perfectly officiated game. (Perhaps few of us would be there to see it anyway). Officials are only poor, inefficient humans like the rest of us, but they take a great pride in their work and stop at nothing in their efforts to improve that work. They do not like to call fouls. They hate it, but they never forget that their job is to see that both teams get a fair deal insofar as the rules make that possible. No one in the past has ever impugned their honesty or doubted their courage. This year there were some aspersions, wholly uncalled for, which reflected on the officials' integrity. May I say that the future of football depends on the integrity of the officials. We now have men officiating in whose hands the game is safe. If by ill-advised and false aspersions we drive the high-grade officials from the game, football will suffer and suffer greatly. We should limit our emotional protests to claiming that they are all blind and dumb. That should be a sufficient safety valve.

It is rather an amusing thing that no one ever blames the players for spoiling a game by committing fouls. Instead we blame the official for calling the fouls our team commits and damn him for failing to call a foul at least every other play on our opponents. The players and most coaches are a lot fairer than the spectators. Occasionally we find a coach who loses his head and grossly insults an official. This is the most cowardly action imaginable. The official's hands are tied. He must take the abuse, for to properly resent it would bring the game into disrepute. He can only penalize the team, and the players suffer for something which is not their fault.

In conclusion, I would say that football seems to be safer from outside attack than it has been in years. Yet it has its abuses, and it would be well for those who are in authority to see that it does not suffer in the house of its friends. The National Collegiate Athletic Association came into existence to save inter-collegiate football. It did save it by courageous and intelligent action. There is still great need for the exercise of that same courage and intelligence. Not newspapers, not spectators, not



coaches can be entrusted with the welfare of college football. Only through the concerted, sane, unselfish coöperation of all the colleges and universities composing this nation-wide Association can the future of the great game of football be assured. I timidly suggest that you hold fast to the faith that amateurism is far more important than gate receipts, and let no man nor group of men take that faith from you.

WALTER R. OKESON,  
*Chairman.*

### GYMNASTICS

During the past year several members of your Committee (Hoffer, Graydon, and Beling) represented the National Collegiate Athletic Association on the American Olympic Gymnastic Committee. The last meeting of the Olympic Committee, called to discuss the reasons for our poor showing in gymnastics at Berlin, revealed several interesting things.

Our gymnasts performed optional exercises of greater difficulty than those of competitors from other countries, but failed to place near the top because:—form, not difficulty, is stressed by the International Gymnastic Federation; the form of the American team was not comparable to that of the other teams; and our men, though attempting difficult moves, did not always execute them smoothly.

These revelations serve to call again to our attention that American gymnasts, particularly the college gymnasts, are likely to minimize the importance of form, continuity, and beauty of exercise as compared with difficulty. Until collegiate gymnasts and their coaches pay particular attention to form and perfection of exercises we cannot hope for improvement of the quality of our performances, and hence representation on the American Olympic team, which, of course, is as desirable as in other sports.

It is obvious that no coach, though he be a master psychologist or a strict disciplinarian, can make his men develop form and perfection except at institutions where sports are compulsory. The desire to do gymnastics and to achieve perfection must arise within the student himself and then be developed and fostered by the competent coach.

We strongly urge the athletic associations of each member of the National Collegiate Athletic Association to give every assistance and encouragement towards the formation, recognition, and continuation of gymnastic teams. It has been the custom to consider gymnastics as just another sport which helps to drain the treasury of an athletic association and contributes

nothing. Today, however, gymnastics is a paying sport in more than one college, and is gaining in popularity throughout the country.

As the year 1936 comes to a close, there are several questions which we venture to pass on to the Committee for 1937 for deliberation and decision:—

1) Sec. I-1: Shall Tumbling remain as an all-around event or be eliminated? If it is removed, shall Long Horse be substituted or shall the events be reduced to include only the Horizontal Bar, Side Horse, Parallel Bars, and Flying Rings?

2) Sec. III-6: Shall the total score be reduced from 110 to 100 points, with the elimination of—"10 for approach and retreat combined" and addition of—Faulty approach and retreat shall be penalized not to exceed 10 (or 5) points. The distribution of the 100 points might be:—40 for execution and general form plus 60 for difficulty and beauty of combination. Also, shall the penalties for faulty approach and retreat be deducted from the 40 or 60 point fraction of the score?

3) Sec. III-6: Shall the method of scoring remain as now used—i.e.—on paper with the scores collected after all exercises have been performed—OR—shall the judges use hand score boards and flash the scores immediately after each exercise so that all may see?

4) Sec. III-8 and IV-8: Revision according to more recent rulings on the Long Horse—with jumps and ratings to conform, possibly, with the Olympic ratings and jumps used at Berlin in 1936.

Other innovations which may considerably advance the progress of collegiate gymnastics are about to be instituted in certain sections and, it is hoped, the 1937 Committee will have reports on these matters by the end of May, 1937.

C. ABBOTT BELING, M.D.,  
*Chairman.*

### ICE HOCKEY

The committee and advisory members met at the Yale Club in New York City April 4th and 5th. While no radical changes were made, due consideration was given to adjusting our rules to harmonize with other amateur rules. It is desirous that all hockey may some time be played under similar rules. At present there are the Canadian, the European (under which the Olympic games are played), the National Hockey League (professional), and the N. C. A. A. rules. The A. A. U. has very recently changed from our rules to the professional rules.



The difficulty in following the professional rules lies more in the fact that they are based on spectator interest than from the standpoint of safety to the player and to the future type of game. Fighting must be penalized by disqualification, as in football, or if allowed to prevail, as in professional hockey, the game may become a questionable activity for colleges and schools.

The Ice Hockey Association of the International Federation, which governs European and Olympic competition, is making an effort to conform toward one set of rules. This is very encouraging, as the game is being rapidly developed throughout Europe. Fifteen nations were represented by teams in the recent Olympic competition.

There are two outstanding technical differences in the four sets of hockey rules. One is the number of participants, and the other the length of the game. The European rules have three periods of fifteen minutes each, and all the others have three periods of twenty minutes. The number of participants varies from eleven to fifteen.

Hockey allows unlimited substitution, but always has limited the number of participants. It began with a number equal to the positions on each team, and in case of injuries the opponents had to drop players to equalize the teams. The Canadian and European rules now allow ten players and an alternate goalkeeper. The professional rules allow fourteen players, exclusive of goalkeepers, and the N. C. A. A. rules permit fifteen players in all.

The duration of the game was originally two periods of twenty minutes each, with ties played out until one side won. Then there were three periods of fifteen minutes and limited overtime. It is now three twenty minute periods, with not more than two overtime periods. The exception is the European rule of three fifteen minute periods.

The arguments in favor of the greater number of players are that more have a chance to take part, and the physical strain is lessened. On the other hand, few teams can afford the expense of taking the full number when away from home, and the home team has a decided advantage in being able to change its players more often. The colleges in general favor the present fifteen player rule, and it is doubtful if the other rules bodies will consider increasing the number of players. We might therefore reduce our number to twelve, with the understanding that it could be increased, even beyond the present rule, by mutual agreement of the competing teams.

The committee welcomes opinions on these matters, and also any other suggestions.

ALBERT I. PRETTYMAN,  
*Chairman.*

## SWIMMING AND WATER SPORTS

Unusual events in intercollegiate and interscholastic swimming have characterized the year 1936. Dean George W. Scott of our Committee reports that in the Rocky Mountain area swimming is fast taking its place among the leading sports; that three colleges are installing new standard swimming pools; and that the conference championship was won by the Colorado School of Mines before a capacity attendance. Interscholastic swimming, he says, is making tremendous strides, especially in Denver and elsewhere in the state where a number of high schools are installing new pools.

The Eastern Intercollegiate Swimming League, developed during the past two years, is made up largely of former members of the Intercollegiate Swimming Association, the oldest league in the United States. The membership of the new league consists of Columbia, Dartmouth, Harvard, Navy, Pennsylvania, Princeton, and Yale, and it is administered by the athletic directors of the various institutions represented instead of under the former plan of graduate and undergraduate committees of the I.S.A. The National Collegiate swimming rules have been adopted to govern its meets.

In the comparatively short time of a dozen years the N.C.A.A. Swimming Championships have grown to be the greatest swimming meet of the country. It merits this distinction because it attracts most of the leading swimmers, coaches, and officials from all sections of the United States.

The 13th annual meet was held at Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, on March 27 and 28, 1936. Thirty-two institutions were entered, with 129 contestants. The institutions represented were:

Amherst	Harvard	Northwestern	Southern Calif.
Bowdoin	Illinois	N. Y. U.	Springfield
Brown	Iowa	Ohio State	U. S. Coast Guard
Chicago	Lehigh	Oregon	Washington
Columbia	Mass. State	Pennsylvania	Wesleyan
Dartmouth	Michigan	Princeton	Western Reserve
Fordham	Minnesota	Rensselaer	Williams
Gustavus	Navy	Rutgers	Yale
Adolphus			

The New England, Middle Atlantic, Middle West, and Pacific Coast areas were especially well represented.

On Friday morning the 1500 meter swim was conducted in Yale's 50 meter practice pool—the only indoor pool of these metric dimensions in a college or university in the United States. The event did, therefore, give a line on intercollegiate distance men in this official Olympic event over a standard Olympic distance. Jack Medica, of the University of Washington at Seattle,



won first place in this event, and Captain Hoyt of Yale, second.

Preliminaries in other events were held on Friday and Saturday afternoons, with finals on Friday and Saturday evenings. This arrangement, which was started in the annual championships last year, again proved to be satisfactory.

Six new intercollegiate and National Collegiate records, one American and two world's records were established in the Championships. Jack Kasley, of the University of Michigan, made the world's record performances in the 200 yards and 200 meters distances in the breast stroke. In fact, Mr. Kasley broke the world's record three different times in the preliminaries or finals. Jack Medica, of the University of Washington, wound up his college career by again winning first place in the 1500 meters, the 440 yards, and the 220 yards swims. This is the third successive year in which he has won first place in each of these events. Last year at Harvard, and at Ohio State University in 1934, Jack Medica established world's records in one or more of these events. The nearest approach to his achievement was made by Victor Schwartz, of Northwestern University, at Harvard in 1930 when he won the 100 yards, the 50 yards, and the 220 yards swims.

The University of Michigan again had the distinction of winning the largest number of places, with the State University of Iowa second. The University of Washington, with Jack Medica as its sole competitor, was third. The following is a list of the N. C. A. A. swimming champions for the year 1936:

1500 meter free style	Jack Medica, Washington
One-meter board diving	Der Johnston, Michigan
50 yard free style	Ray Walters, Iowa
150 yard back-stroke	Dan Zehr, Northwestern
220 yard free style	Jack Medica, Washington
300 yard medley relay	Michigan
200 yard breast stroke	Jack Kasley, Michigan
440 yard free style	Jack Medica, Washington
100 yard free style	Charles Hutter, Harvard
Three-meter board diving	Frank Fehsenfeld, Michigan
400 yard relay	Iowa

As in past Olympiads, this year's Championships were designated as an Olympic Try-Out, and in addition to the award of medals and plaques, of a moderate cost, the winners of first, second, third, and fourth places received Olympic certificates. In accordance with action taken by the Swimming Rules Committee and approved by the N. C. A. A. Executive Council, the net proceeds of this meet were to be contributed to the American Olympic Committee, earmarked for the Olympic Men's Swimming Committee budget. The gross receipts were \$2,131.16, expenditures \$350.76, and the net contribution to the Olympic Men's Swimming, \$1,780.40.

Between and following the sessions of the National Collegiate

Championships, the Rules Committee held its annual business meetings. A number of significant changes in the program and order of events were made which, it is believed, will be influential in unifying more completely the standard playing rules for various sections of the country. The most significant of these changes is the following:

That hereafter the National Collegiate Swimming Championship Meet be conducted as a team championship, and that a trophy be awarded to the winning team.

A vote of thanks was extended to Director Farmer and his staff and to Yale University for their fine hospitality, and especially for the low cost of conducting the meet. Thanks are also due to Coach Kiphuth and his associates and Student Manager Pond for the excellent manner in which the many detailed requirements for the meet were carried out. The Championships were the most successful we have ever had.

The detailed results of the preliminaries and finals will appear in the Intercollegiate Swimming Guide. There has been an unfortunate delay in the publication of the Guide, due chiefly to the illness of Editor Kennedy of Columbia. At this writing it is hoped that the Guide may be out before the holidays, in order that it may render a maximum usefulness.

Organized and active coöperation with the Olympic Men's Swimming Committee was one of the chief objectives of the Rules Committee in 1936. Of our present Rules Committee, Kennedy, Kiphuth, and the Chairman have been active members and officials of the Olympic Men's Swimming Committee. Kiphuth served as Coach, Kennedy as Secretary and Manager, and the writer as Chairman of the Olympic men's swimming organization. Due to the widely scattered location of Olympic Swimming Committee men, the above-named National Collegiate Association trio served as an unofficial executive committee, with frequent meetings and much correspondence and referenda to other members of the National Collegiate and Olympic Swimming Committees. Other present or former advisory committee members who shared in Olympic activities were Fred Cady, of the University of Southern California, head Olympic diving coach, Ernst Brandsten, Stanford University, assistant diving coach, and Matt Mann, of Michigan University, member of the Olympic Swimming Committee. Years of coöperation, especially in connection with National Collegiate swimming rules activities, paved the way for similar coöperation in Olympic swimming affairs.

Present and former members of our committee helped by arousing interest in Olympic swimming, working for the development of college and school boy swimmers for membership on the



American team, and especially in raising funds to send the team to the Olympic Games. Raising funds was especially difficult because of the strong, organized, and persistent opposition to sending a team. Each Olympic team committee was made responsible for raising the funds needed if the sport was to be represented on the Olympic program. With very few exceptions the N. C. A. A. committee membership and constituency rendered most valuable services in fund raising.

In spite of organized opposition, and the generally disastrous economic situation in various parts of the country, the financial campaign for the needs of the Olympic Men's Swimming Committee was highly successful. A total of approximately \$20,000 was raised. This amount met the cost of financing a well-rounded team to the Games, and provided nearly \$5,000 to the overhead of the General Olympic Committee. In addition, it made possible a contribution of \$800 to the needs of the Olympic Women's Swimming Committee.

Of the total funds raised, \$5,000 was derived from the final Olympic try-outs for men's swimming, held at Providence, R. I., and sponsored by the Rhode Island and Providence Plantation Tercentenary Committee. Four thousand dollars came from the Final Olympic Try-outs for Mens' Diving and Water Polo, which was sponsored by the Illinois Athletic Club and the Chicago Park Board. Two thousand was derived from the 1936 and 1935 N. C. A. A. Championships, and more than \$2,000 additional was contributed from colleges, universities, preparatory schools, intercollegiate and interscholastic conferences, and from members of the Intercollegiate Swimming Coaches Association. The remainder came from various other organizations, such as the A. A. U., the Y. M. C. A., and from personal contributions made directly to the Olympic Committee and earmarked for Men's Swimming.

Of the total amount raised by universities, colleges, preparatory and high school organizations, the following contributions are outstanding:

The Yale University Swimming Management, under the leadership of Coach Kiphuth, raised over \$800 by a great water carnival held in the fine Yale exhibition swimming pool, with its large seating capacity. Michigan and Pennsylvania contributed \$200 or more each, and Bowdoin, Harvard, Penn State, Stanford, Mercersburg Academy, the Big Ten Conference, and the Missouri Valley Conference each made contributions of \$100 or more. Columbia, Dartmouth, Lafayette, Oberlin, Rennselaer, Swarthmore, Temple, the University of Chicago; Andover, Exeter, and Suffolk schools; and the Pennsylvania Interscholastic Athletic Association all made significant contributions.

The Committee is pleased to refer to the achievement of intercollegiate and interscholastic swimmers of the United States in

the Olympics of 1936. The American divers again won the Olympic championship, in both the 3 meter and 10 meter heights. Dick Degener, a former N. C. A. A. champion, won first place from the springboard, and Marshall Wayne, a former N. C. A. A. runner-up, won first place in the platform diving. Jack Medica, of the University of Washington, America's greatest and triple champion, won first place in the 400 meter event and second in the 1500 meter, and set world, Olympic, and American records. Adolph Kiefer, a Chicago school boy and holder of a number of world's back stroke records, won first place in the 100 meter back stroke event, and Albert Vande Weeghe of the Hun School was second. The American 800 meter relay team, consisting of John Macionis of Yale, Jack Medica of Washington, Ralph Flannigan, a Miami, Florida schoolboy, and Paul Wolf of Los Angeles, placed second to the distinguished Japanese team.

FREDERICK W. LUEHRING,  
*Chairman.*

#### TRACK AND FIELD

The committee met to discuss rules on June 18th, 1936, at Chicago, with all members present except Harry L. Hillman (First District). The committee also acted as the Games Committee for the N. C. A. A. Championships which were held at Chicago June 19-20, 1936.

#### Rules

At the rules meeting no important changes were made, but the wording of a number of rules was revised to eliminate misinterpretation.

Following the action of the International Amateur Athletic Federation in August the committee adopted, by mail vote, the new international rule designed to eliminate ties in the pole vault and high jump. Since this ruling is somewhat complicated it is given in full below.

"If two or more competitors tie at any height in the high jump or pole vault:

a) The competitor with a lower number of failures at the tying height shall be placed ahead of the competitor with a higher number.

b) If the tie still remains the competitor with the lower total of failures until having cleared the tying height shall be placed ahead of the competitor with a higher total.



c) If the tie still remains the competitor with the lower total of attempts until having cleared the tying height shall be placed ahead of the competitor with a higher total.

d) 1. If the tie still remains, and if it concerns the first place, an additional trial at the height failed shall be allowed, and if no result the bar shall be lowered to the previous height cleared and one more trial allowed. The bar shall then be raised or lowered until the tie is decided.

2. If the tie still remains but does not concern the first place the competitors tying shall be given the same placement in the competition."

This rule may be waived and the old rule followed by mutual agreement when it is considered too complicated for administration by the officials available.

### *The Annual Meet*

Because the Fifteenth Annual Meet was an Olympic Semi-Final Tryout, the Olympic metric distances were substituted for the usual English distances. Official times were taken, however, at both metric and English distances in the shorter races, and the records set by Jesse Owens in the 100 yards, Archie Williams in the 440 yards, and Forrest Towns in the 120 yards hurdles will appear in the N. C. A. A. records.

All of the net proceeds of the meet, \$5,607.99, went to the benefit of the American Olympic Track and Field Fund. Therefore no travel allowances were paid except to the first and second place winners of the 1935 meet. The entry, however, was quite representative and included most of the outstanding college athletes of the year. Seventy-nine schools and 280 athletes were represented in the entry list. Athletes from thirty-three schools scored points. Place winners in the N. C. A. A. meet made up thirty-two per cent of the American Olympic Team and won forty-nine per cent of the American team's points. The remaining fifty-one per cent of America's points were won by either former N. C. A. A. place winners or by athletes who within the next two or three years should become N. C. A. A. place winners. Seven out of ten Olympic championships in track and field were won by N. C. A. A. champions of 1936.

The following new records were established.

100 yards—9.4—Jesse Owens—Equals world, American, Collegiate, and N. C. A. A. record.

100 meters—10.2—Jesse Owens—Equals N. C. A. A. record (not accepted as World Record).

440 yards—46.5—Archie Williams—Collegiate and N. C. A. A. record.

1500 meters—3:53.0—Archie San Romani—N. C. A. A. record.

5000 meters—14:58.5—Donald Lash—(new event) N. C. A. A. record.

100 meters—14.1—Forrest Towns—World, American, Collegiate, and N. C. A. A. record.

120 yards hurdles—14.1—Forrest Towns—World, American record. Equals Collegiate and N. C. A. A. record.

Pole vault—14' 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ "—Earle Meadows, William Sefton—N. C. A. A. record.

Hop, Step and Jump—48' 5 $\frac{1}{8}$ "—Herschel Neil—N. C. A. A. record.

Discus—173'—Kenneth Carpenter—World, American, Collegiate, N. C. A. A. record.

Javelin—226' 2 $\frac{3}{4}$ "—Alton Terry—American, Collegiate, and N. C. A. A. record.

### *The Olympic Games*

N. C. A. A. representatives played an active part in the affairs of the American Olympic Track and Field team.

The N. C. A. A. representatives on the Olympic Track and Field Games committee included William J. Bingham (Harvard), who served as chairman; T. Nelson Metcalf (Chicago), who served as secretary; Alfred R. Masters (Stanford), and Kenneth L. Wilson (Northwestern). Two other members of the committee, A. C. Gilbert (Yale) and Romeyn Berry (Cornell) have active connections with member institutions of the N. C. A. A.

The following college officials were members of the Olympic Track and Field party. Manager, William J. Bingham (Harvard); Assistant Managers, Alfred R. Masters (Stanford), T. Nelson Metcalf (Chicago); Head Coach, Lawson Robertson (Pennsylvania); Assistant Coaches, Dean Cromwell (Southern California), E. C. Hayes (Indiana), Brutus Hamilton (California); Advisory Coaches, Larry Snyder (Ohio State), Carl Olsen (Pittsburgh), F. G. Welch (Kansas Teachers—Emporia), H. J. Stegeman (Georgia), Fred Tootell (Rhode Island State); Trainers, Jack Weber (Fordham), W. H. Morris (Pennsylvania); Seymour Van Blake (Princeton).

T. N. METCALF,  
*Chairman.*



## WRESTLING

The Ninth Annual National Collegiate Wrestling Championships were held at Washington & Lee University, Lexington, Virginia, on March 20th and 21st, last, under the most adverse weather conditions we had ever encountered. Heavy rain and snow storms throughout the East and South resulted in floods which made impassable every highway into Lexington for a time, caused the cancellation of service on all but one railroad, and forced the Committee to consider seriously postponement of the meet. A considerable number of institutions which had entered contestants were obliged to cancel the same, but twenty-three teams succeeded in reaching Lexington in time for the meet. While the above mentioned conditions decidedly reduced the expected number of participants, seventy-two of the outstanding college wrestlers of the country competed for National Collegiate honors and the right to participate in the Final American Olympic Wrestling Tryouts, for which the first four place winners in each weight-class qualified. The anticipated number of spectators and resulting gate receipts were further curtailed by a heavy snow storm during the day of the meet, which rendered auto travel decidedly hazardous.

The strong well-balanced University of Oklahoma team replaced Oklahoma A. & M. College as National Champions. The team scores and individual championships resulted as follows:

### TEAM SCORES

(Five points for 1st; 3 points for 2nd; 1 point for 3rd)

Place	Team	Points
1st	Oklahoma University	16
Tie for 2nd	Oklahoma Central State Teachers College	10
and 3rd	Oklahoma A. & M. College	10
Tie for 4th	Lehigh University	5
and 5th	Michigan State College	5
6th	Oklahoma So-West State Teachers College	4
Tie for 7th	Indiana University	3
and 8th	Cornell College (Iowa)	3
9th	State University of Iowa	2
Tie for 10th	Michigan University	1
and 11th	U. S. Naval Academy	1

### FIRST FOUR INDIVIDUAL PLACE WINNERS AND QUALIFIERS FOR THE FINAL AMERICAN OLYMPIC WRESTLING TRYOUTS

123-lb.

Ted Anderson, Central Teachers, Edmond, Oklahoma.  
D. C. Matthews, Oklahoma University, Norman, Oklahoma.  
Joe Parkey, Southwestern State Teachers, Weatherford, Oklahoma.  
Willard Duffey, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

134-lb.

Wayne Martin, Oklahoma University, Norman, Oklahoma.  
Dale Brand, Cornell College, Mt. Vernon, Iowa.  
Earl Thomas, Michigan University, Ann Arbor, Michigan.  
George Hanks, Southwestern State Teachers, Weatherford, Oklahoma.

145-lb.

H. D. Strong, Oklahoma University, Norman, Oklahoma.  
Carl Kitt, Southwestern State Teachers, Weatherford, Oklahoma.  
Byron Guernsey, Iowa University, Iowa City, Iowa.  
Joe Kalpin, Oklahoma University, Norman, Oklahoma.

158-lb.

Walter Jacob, Michigan State College, East Lansing, Michigan.  
Bill Keas, Oklahoma University, Norman, Oklahoma.  
Earl Keilhorn, Iowa University, Iowa City, Iowa.  
Hugh Bishop, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Penn.  
Caifson Johnson, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

174-lb.

Harry Broadbent, Oklahoma University, Norman, Oklahoma.  
Dormer Browning, Oklahoma A. & M., Stillwater, Oklahoma.  
Raymond Vogel, Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland.  
McCullough, Southwestern State Teachers, Weatherford, Oklahoma.

191-lb.

Clemons, Central Teachers, Edmond, Oklahoma.  
Charles McDaniel, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.  
Willard Loretti, Oklahoma A. & M., Stillwater, Oklahoma.  
Richard Landis, Temple University, Philadelphia, Penn.

Unlimited

Howell Scobey, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Penn.  
Hugo Bonino, Washington & Lee University, Lexington, Virginia.  
Gordon Dupree, Oklahoma A. & M., Stillwater, Oklahoma.

### FINANCIAL STATEMENT

#### Receipts:

Gate Receipts (less federal tax)	\$1,462.78
Entry fees—72 @ \$2.00	146.00
Contribution (Collection for American Olympic Wrestling Fund)	29.10

Total Receipts \$1,637.88

#### Disbursements:

Tickets, Advertising, and Postage	\$98.36
Erection of Bleachers and Extra Help	55.10
Officials (Expenses Only)	132.36
Ticket Sellers, Takers, and Ushers	52.40
Luncheon	41.50
Office Expenses and Extra Help	42.84
Printing Programs, Official's Cards, Etc.	112.00
Laundry	9.75
Photos of Winners for Wrestling Guide	14.00

Total Disbursements 558.31

Net Receipts Donated to American Olympic Wrestling Fund \$1,079.57



Inasmuch as this meet was a semi-final American Olympic wrestling tryout the Olympic Rules were used in place of the National Collegiate Code. Mr. R. A. Smith, Tournament Director, and Mr. A. E. Mathis, Wrestling Coach, and the other local representatives deserve much credit for their able management of all local arrangements for the meet. The referees did an exceptionally fine piece of work, and the Committee especially appreciates their courtesy in donating their services.

#### *Meeting of the Wrestling Coaches Association*

As usual the Wrestling Coaches Association held its annual meeting in connection with the National Collegiate Wrestling Championships. The cup donated annually by the Coaches Association to the outstanding wrestler in the National Collegiate Wrestling Championships was awarded to Wayne Martin of the University of Oklahoma. The following officers were elected for the ensuing year: President, Paul V. Keen, Wrestling Coach at the University of Oklahoma; Vice-President, William Sheridan, Wrestling Coach at Lehigh University; and Secretary-Treasurer, W. Austin Bishop, who has just been appointed Wrestling Coach at the University of Pennsylvania.

#### *Semi-Final and Final American Olympic Wrestling Tryouts*

##### *District Tryouts—*

The Chairman of the National Collegiate Wrestling Rules Committee, acting in the capacity of Secretary of the American Olympic Wrestling Committee, conducted practically all of the negotiations for the location and general arrangements for the seventeen district semi-final tryouts which were held. Six of these district tryouts were conducted under local college management, and several of the remaining tryouts, although not technically held under college management, were handled, in part at least, by college representatives. The winner of first place in each of the seven weight-classes in each of these seventeen district tryouts qualified for the Final Tryouts.

##### *National Championship Semi-final Tryouts—*

The National Collegiate, National Y. M. C. A., and National A. A. U. Wrestling Championships also constituted semi-final American Olympic wrestling tryouts, and the first four place winners in each weight-class in each of these meets also qualified for the Final Tryouts.

##### *Final Tryouts—*

The Final American Olympic Wrestling Tryouts were held at Lehigh University on April 16th, 17th, and 18th last, and were,

in every way, the most successful final tryouts ever held in this country. In 1924, 1928, and 1932 all fourteen members of the American Olympic Wrestling Team were college or ex-college wrestlers. This year thirteen of the fourteen members of the team were college or ex-college wrestlers—one very fine Y. M. C. A. wrestler defeated the college representatives in the 134-lb. class.

##### *Olympic Wrestling—*

Figured on the usual basis of 5-3-1 points for first, second, and third places respectively, the American Olympic Wrestling Team won the Olympic free-style championship—taking one first and three second places. Lewis won the Olympic 158-lb. championship, and Flood, Voliva, and Millard placed second respectively in the 123-lb., 174-lb., and 134-lb. classes. The first three mentioned are former National Collegiate champions in their respective classes, and Millard was the 1936 Y. M. C. A. National Champion. As usual there was much criticism of the officiating in the final matches, and most of our representatives felt that at least two of our representatives who won second places would have taken championships had the officiating been impartial.

##### *American Olympic Finances—*

The American Olympic Wrestling Committee raised all the funds necessary to send our team to Berlin. The amount raised was slightly less than \$9,000. Of this amount more than half was contributed by the colleges—partly through gate receipts or tryouts conducted under college auspices or by personal solicitation by college representatives. The amount secured from receipts of tryouts locally managed by college representatives was as follows:

Final Tryouts held at Lehigh University	\$2,143.54
National Collegiate Championships—1936—held at Washington & Lee University	1,079.57
National Collegiate Championships—1935 (5% gross receipts minus Federal tax)	127.14
Collection at 1936 Penn State-Lehigh dual wrestling meet held at Bethlehem	104.42
Missouri Valley district tryouts held at Kansas State Agricultural College	48.55
Pacific Northwest district tryouts held at the University of Washington	80.65
Atlantic Seaboard district tryouts held at Davidson College, Davidson, North Carolina	22.12
Inter-Mountain district tryouts held at University of Utah	29.70
Oklahoma district tryouts held at Oklahoma Central State Teachers College	102.05
Total receipts from all college managed tryouts	\$3,737.74
Total receipts from all tryouts	\$4,610.79



In addition to the above, quite a substantial amount was raised by personal solicitation by local college representatives to help pay the expenses of their representatives who made the American Olympic Wrestling Team. The balance was raised primarily by the personal solicitation of Mr. C. W. Streit, Chairman of the American Olympic Wrestling Committee. A comparison of the receipts from the three 1936 National Championship Meets may be of interest: The National Collegiate Championships, held at Washington & Lee University, returned \$1,079.57; the National Y. M. C. A. Championships, held at Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, Y. M. C. A., returned \$144.68; and the National A. A. U. Championships, held at Chicago, returned \$6.73.

#### *Meetings of Wrestling Rules Committee—*

All members were present at the meeting of the Committee with the exception of Mr. Wiggins, the High School Representative, although several were delayed in reaching Lexington because of flood conditions. Altogether, five sessions were held, at which time proposed changes in the Wrestling Rules were thoroughly discussed. For the first time in the history of our Committee work no changes in the College Rules were approved for the ensuing year and only a few minor changes in the High School Rules. Lack of approval of many of the proposed changes for the College Code does not necessarily mean that the Committee is opposed to such changes but rather hesitation in approving such changes without fuller assurance of their desirability. The Committee has always been conservative in approving suggested changes in rules of competition, and, to date, has never found it necessary or desirable to rescind previous action taken, and all changes which have been made have, sooner or later, received quite unanimous approval of the college wrestling coaches.

#### *General Progress in College and High School Wrestling—*

During the past year there has not been any startling increase in participation or general interest in college and high school wrestling, but there has been what might be termed normal, healthy progress which indicates that the sport is on a good sound foundation, and will take a more prominent part in the sports program as time goes on.

R. G. CLAPP, M.D.,  
Chairman.

## REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES

### I. ON RADIO BROADCASTING OF ATHLETIC EVENTS

The undersigned committee was appointed by order of the Council of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, in December, 1935, with instructions to report upon the various phases of radio broadcasting of athletic events at the December, 1936 meeting. Shortly thereafter your committee agreed upon two questionnaire forms, one to be sent to secretaries or commissioners of athletic conferences, and the other to be sent to chairmen of faculty athletic boards of educational institutions. The questionnaires were sent forth under date of January 4, and were all mailed at about that date. The responses have been received over the entire period since then, a few of them arriving during the month of November.

Of the conference questionnaires, some forty copies were distributed, and twenty-three were filled and returned. Of the questionnaires distributed among chairmen of faculty athletic boards, some 400 were sent out, and 122 were filled and returned. Numerous letters were received in lieu of filled questionnaires from faculty representatives of smaller institutions expressing complete lack of experience and information of useful character. It is thought that the responses which were received in the questionnaires fairly well represent the experiences and opinions of the conferences and faculty athletic committees in respect to the radio broadcasting of intercollegiate athletic events.

A satisfactory answer to the important question whether radio broadcasting adversely affects attendance at athletic events appears to be difficult if not impossible to obtain. There are so many factors bearing upon attendance and upon the individual impulses of those who attend games or stay home or in their places of business to listen to a broadcast, that a study calculated to get at the ultimate facts of the matter would appear to be doomed only to terminate in the expression of an opinion. Out of a group of questionnaires returned by some forty-eight of the athletically most prominent institutions, thirty-three concurred in expressing the belief that broadcasting does reduce attendance. The balance appeared to be in doubt, with only three or four affirmatively suggesting that radio publicity might, in the long run, increase attendance. These frankly acknowledged, however, that radio broadcasting is undoubtedly hurtful to attendance in bad weather. The almost unanimous opinion among the smaller colleges was that the radio broadcasting of games does tend to reduce attendance. Quite a number of the athletically less publicized schools complained that the broadcasting of games being played between prominent institutions not only, in their opinion,



hurts attendance at the games being so reported, but also tends to reduce greatly the attendance at games being played at other points between less well-known teams. There can be little doubt that professional athletic organizations feel that broadcasting tends to reduce attendance and that the privilege should be the subject of compensation.

Your committee has sought to obtain some information concerning possible criticisms which may arise, or which in the past have arisen, from the sale of exclusive radio broadcasting privileges. The great majority of schools were unable to give any helpful statements of experience on this subject. The replies which do indicate experience, however, indicate also that the criticism largely originates with parties having interests opposed to the disbursement of money in exchange for radio privileges. Such parties are to be expected to use argument, criticism, and possibly pressure to obtain the desired privileges free of charge or at as low a price as possible. It is observed that some of the past criticism originated with newspapers, but in each instance of experience, the newspaper interests were closely allied with certain radio interests, which would be affected by the making of an exclusive sale of the broadcasting privilege, or be required to give substantial compensation for the same.

Several institutions reported having sold their radio broadcasting privileges on bases having exclusive or semi-exclusive features. Criticisms of these transactions have been made for the following expressed reasons:

1. The broadcasting of intercollegiate games is a public service, like the distribution of news, and broadcasting companies should no more be required to pay for the radio privilege than should the press agencies be required to pay for information having a news value.

2. Institutions supported by public funds and all activities within the same are the common property of taxpayers and they are entitled to have the interesting events presented to them without cost, through radio broadcasting, newspapers, etc.

3. The sale of the broadcasting privileges involves a degree of commercialization of intercollegiate spectacles which is incompatible with, and opposed to, the proper dignity of an educational institution, and the maintenance of an amateur athletic program.

The opinions responsive to these criticisms from the radio broadcasting companies taken in the order stated are:

1. That the purpose of the radio company is primarily to "sustain" the interest of the listener so as to hold his attention for advertising, for which the radio station receives compensation, or at least the "advertising" of the radio station itself. Thus

the radio company is engaged in capitalizing upon the public interest which it should not be entitled to do at the expense of the competing institutions, the athletic funds of which are believed to be adversely affected by the stay-at-home listeners, but which must bear all of the expenses of the contests.

2. The response to the second argument for the granting of free radio broadcasting privileges set forth above has been to the effect that the taxpayer is entitled to enjoy the services of the institution as an educational agency, but only subject to regulations and reasonable charges as approved and instituted by the trustees, boards of regents, or boards of education. No taxpayer, as such, would be entitled to be admitted to see the games without paying the usual ticket charges at the gate, nor entitled to sit in a classroom without paying the usual charges of fees and tuitions. The taxpayer supports numerous institutions which manufacture products. He is not, as a taxpayer, however, entitled to receive any part of their products without paying reasonable charges for the same, fixed by the governing officers or boards of the institutions involved. It is argued that taxpayers are in fact better served by a requirement that radio broadcasting companies pay fairly for the privileges of broadcasting, since the payment so received will help to support the intercollegiate athletic events, as well as possibly other activities and thus reduce the expenses to be paid from tax funds.

3. The third argument against the sale of radio broadcasting privileges has been met by the statement that it is no less dignified to sell broadcasting rights to games than to sell admission rights (tickets), concessionaire privileges, programs, program advertising, and numerous other commodities and privileges frequently sold by universities, such as theater tickets, products of dairy husbandry departments, products of agricultural department farms, meals, dance tickets, dormitory space, locker space, laboratory equipment and supplies, class room supplies, etc. It is conceded that the advertising of certain types of merchandise in conjunction with intercollegiate athletic events would appear to be unseemly, or undignified. As illustrations there may be mentioned intoxicating liquors, intimate articles of apparel, etc. It would seem, however, that faculty athletic committees should be relied upon to exercise sound judgment in providing against the advertising of such commodities.

In the past it has been customary where schools have agreed upon a division of income from an athletic event to refer to the "gate receipts." This excludes income from advertising, programs, concessions, etc. In instances in the future, however, particularly where the radio income is considerable, it may well be expected that contracting schools will agree to include a division of the radio income with the division of the proceeds from



sales of tickets. This is particularly true, since the radio income is so widely thought to be at least in part due to sacrificing a portion of the gate receipts. The Secretary of the Pacific Coast Intercollegiate Conference, which has sold all radio broadcasting rights of the conferences for football games, reports that their plan for division of radio receipts is "in general in proportion to gate receipts, though not exactly."

The questionnaires which indicate experience with sales of radio broadcasting privileges indicate also an opinion that the proceeds of sales of radio privileges should be in some way fairly divided among the competing schools. Some member schools of various conferences indicated a belief that a fixed plan of division should be the subject of a conference rule, though a strong minority of institutions expressed the opinion that a division of radio income might better be left to individual school negotiations. It is of course obvious that a conference rule would be necessary in any case where privileges are sold for an entire conference membership as a conference transaction.

Question No. 10 of the institutional questionnaire requested an expression of opinion with respect to the interest of a visiting school in granting authority to make a broadcast of a game. It is clear that the visiting team has no right to grant such privilege except by first obtaining the privilege of doing so from the home institution authorities. This inquiry brought forth considerably varied answers. These indicate that there is some need for a common understanding among conference member schools within the respective conferences. Two factors seem to be prominent in the thoughts of the respondents. First, that certain courtesies should be shown to radio stations owned by the institutions represented by the visitors, and second, that sponsored programs, if any are allowed, should be controlled by the home schools in respect to the commodities advertised, and the type of advertising material inserted in the programs. There were also expressions of an opinion that fair compensation for the privileges should be paid by the visiting school to the home school where the former sells the privilege with the consent of the latter.

Based upon an assumption of the non-existence of any present right of a visiting team to designate or authorize a radio station to broadcast a contest for a sponsor or advertiser, the question was asked whether a provision for such a right should be left to the respective schools or made the subject of a conference regulation. Of the schools which belong to conferences, a minority amounting almost to half favored having a conference rule. The remaining number preferred leaving the question to agreements between the institutions concerned. Some schools declined to answer the question on the ground that they were not members of any conference. As indicated above, this subject seems to be one upon which the various conferences might profitably consider the early passage of some legislation.

About two-thirds of the forty-eight athletically prominent schools which answered questionnaires indicated a belief that the basic principles governing the granting of broadcasting privileges should be worked out by conferences. In the interest of the institutions which are not members of conferences, and by way of offering some assistance to all institutions, it would seem that the National Collegiate Athletic Association might well express a code of general principles dealing with the subject of broadcasting. A few such generalizations are submitted as conclusions at the end of this report.

About three-fourths of the athletically prominent schools which replied, and practically all of the smaller institutions, agreed that a difference exists between radio broadcasting and newspaper reporting of games such that a distinction may properly be made between the facilities accorded to newspapers on the one hand and radio broadcasting companies on the other. This opinion was based upon the marked difference between the way advertising is interspersed in reports of games by radio and the way it is carried in newspapers which report athletic events.

In response to the fifteenth question of the questionnaire as to whether there is a public interest in athletic events comparable to that in governmental activities, which in a sense entitles the public to be contemporaneously informed about them, practically every school answered in the negative. It was interesting to observe that of the entire one hundred sixty-five communications received in response to inquiries, all but twenty of these communications being in the form of filled questionnaires, only three or four supposed that such a public interest exists. One of these came from a non-conference and non-state institution. It suggested that an obligation does exist to the taxpaying supporters of the state institutions, but added the query whether the public on this basis could not demand a broadcasting of all class-room lectures.

In response to the specific question whether the state proprietorship of an institution should make any difference in the matter of selling or refusing broadcasting privileges, the schools were again divided. Practically all state institutions responded in the negative. One suggested that a public interest would be much more entitled to recognition if the intercollegiate athletic program were not self-supporting, but were supported out of tax funds. Two schools recognized the public interest, but indicated that recognition was based more upon expediency than upon any abstract conceptions of right or propriety. There can be no doubt that state institutions can be controlled by state legislation upon the subject in question, but in the absence of legislation the respective state boards of education would seem to have power within their sound discretion to sell, grant without charge, or entirely to refuse broadcasting privileges in respect to athletic events. These discretionary powers would normally be delegated to the athletic authorities at the institutions.



### *Replies from Conferences*

A compilation of responses of the conferences which filled and returned questionnaires has been made. There were twenty-three of these; replies from all the more prominent conferences are included. Upon the most cursory examination of these replies, it becomes apparent that there has been so little experience with radio broadcasting by most conferences that their reactions to the problems involved can gather little weight from their actual practices excepting in the case of the Pacific Coast Intercollegiate Athletic Conference.

That conference has sold exclusive broadcasting rights for all conference games for all member schools in football. In making such sale, no reservations were made of broadcasting privileges for radio broadcasting stations owned by the competing schools, and no restrictions were put on in favor of local broadcasting commercial stations located near the places where the games were to be played. The proceeds of the sales were divided approximately in proportion to the gate receipts, though not exactly so. The secretary of that conference reported that the member schools, after having had experience with the same, favor conference control of the sale of all broadcasting rights and privileges. That conference has made no effort to ascertain whether the broadcasting of games has increased or decreased attendance.

It is interesting to observe that, in spite of their sweeping sales of conference radio broadcasting rights, the Pacific Coast Conference has no knowledge of any protest made by advertisers or radio companies on the score of being denied the privilege of broadcasting due to the exclusive sale made by that conference.

None of the conferences, including the Pacific Coast, report any political comments or pressures in respect to the sale of broadcasting privileges, exclusive or non-exclusive.

The North Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference reports that it formerly had a rule against its members permitting broadcasting, but that by reason of alumni pressure this action was later rescinded. The North Central now reports that most of its member schools own their own broadcasting stations, and as such do broadcast football and basketball games, while the Southern Conference reports that on December 14th, 1935, they repealed a rule which had been among their by-laws for many years. This rule expressly prohibited the broadcasting of all regular season football games played in Southern Conference territory in which a Southern Conference institution was a participant.

A study of the meager information made available by these conference replies admits only of the following generalizations:

1. Conferences representing groups of schools have found it possible to legislate upon the subject of radio broadcasting to the extent of making flat prohibitions of the same. Their action in doing so, however, has brought about a certain amount of

pressure for broadcasting which the experienced conferences ascribe to their alumni and others because of their interest in games which they were unable to attend.

2. At least one prominent conference has been successful in selling all of its radio broadcasting privileges exclusively as a conference with apparent satisfaction to all members both with respect to the granting of the privilege and to the divisions of the proceeds.

### *Conclusion*

In conclusion it may be said that the following statements would seem to be sound as general principles upon which to base transactions involving broadcasting of intercollegiate athletic events:

1. The broadcasting privilege is a proper subject of sale.
2. The visiting school has no right to grant broadcasting privileges, nor any right to any part of the proceeds of the sale of the same, excepting as derived by express agreement with the home institution.
3. Home schools in selling broadcasting privileges should as a courtesy reserve privileges for the visiting institution, but courtesies enjoyed by the latter, as above indicated, must be the subject of agreement.
4. No conference can by any sale of broadcasting rights bind all of its member schools unless they have previously expressly agreed to be bound by such transaction.

Committee on Radio Broadcasting  
of Athletic Events,

R. A. FETZER,  
University of North Carolina  
H. C. WILLETT,  
University of Southern California  
C. M. UPDEGRAFF, *Chairman*,  
State University of Iowa

(The following form with suitable changes to provide for special agreements and local legal requirements may be used for the sale of broadcasting privileges.)

### MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

This agreement made at.....on  
this.....day of....., 19..... by and  
between the Board in Control of Athletics of the.....



University of the County of \_\_\_\_\_, State of \_\_\_\_\_,  
party of the first part, and \_\_\_\_\_  
of the city of \_\_\_\_\_, County of \_\_\_\_\_,  
State of \_\_\_\_\_, party of the second part,  
WITNESSETH:

I. The party of the first part hereby agrees to sell and convey and the party of the second part hereby agrees to purchase upon the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth, for use in advertising its products, the license and privilege of radio broadcasting or reporting from a suitable booth in the stadium at \_\_\_\_\_ University the \_\_\_\_\_ games to be participated in by the team of the said University during the season of \_\_\_\_\_, the said games being as follows: \_\_\_\_\_

II. In consideration of the said license and the rights and privileges appertaining thereto, the party of the second part agrees to pay to the party of the first part the sum of \$ \_\_\_\_\_, payable as follows: \_\_\_\_\_

III. It is agreed that the home radio station of the \_\_\_\_\_ University, \_\_\_\_\_, which has a daytime power assignment of \_\_\_\_\_ watts, may also broadcast all of the said games without reduction of the consideration to be paid by the second party hereto.

IV. It is agreed that a radio station, without reduction of the consideration above set forth, if the same is owned and operated by the institution of the opposing team, may also make a radio broadcast of the game, but no re-broadcast of the same shall be allowed.

V. It is further agreed that no other broadcast of any kind whatsoever will be authorized by either of the parties hereto excepting as follows: \_\_\_\_\_

VI. It is agreed that the party of the second part will make a suitable provision for broadcasting station time, line charges, announcers, etc. and that the party of the second part will furnish at its own expense a capable sports announcer subject to the approval of the party of the first part.

VII. It is agreed that the party of the second part will not authorize or permit any commercial comment to be made while the play of any game is in progress and that commercial

announcements by the said party of the second part will be brief and dignified.

VIII. It is agreed that the party of the first part will furnish to the party of the second part without additional expense over and above the consideration heretofore stated herein the services of one or more individuals to help identify the players, supply statistics at the end of the half and at the end of the game, and provide statistical materials concerning both teams and the individual players thereon before the start of the game and furnish scores of other games being played by leading teams in the Middle West or other parts of the country, which scores may be of interest to listeners, and will assist in gathering other related information calculated to make the radio programs more interesting.

IX. It is agreed that the party of the first part will admit without charge other than the consideration recited herein \_\_\_\_\_ persons to each of the said games for which the party of the second part is hereby purchasing the radio broadcasting rights and privileges.

X. It is understood by and between the parties hereto that the Board in Control of Athletics is a subordinate organization at the \_\_\_\_\_ University under the \_\_\_\_\_ Board of Education, and that this contract between the party of the first part and the party of the second part hereto shall be regarded as binding and in full force and effect upon the parties only after it has received the approval of the president of the \_\_\_\_\_ University and the \_\_\_\_\_ Board of Education.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties of the first part and of the second part have caused their respective signatures to be hereto affixed by their duly authorized officers at \_\_\_\_\_ this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 19\_\_\_\_.

PARTY OF THE FIRST PART.

By \_\_\_\_\_

PARTY OF THE SECOND PART.

By \_\_\_\_\_



## II. ON INFLUENCES INIMICAL TO THE BEST INTERESTS OF INTER-COLLEGIATE SPORT

One year ago President Griffith appointed a committee composed of Professor Philip O. Badger, New York University, Professor H. H. King, Kansas State College, and Professor Z. G. Clevenger, Indiana University, Chairman, with two specific duties, namely:

First: To study the N. C. A. A. code on recruiting and subsidizing with the view of determining whether the committee would recommend any changes in its provisions, or any alterations in the wording itself.

Second: "To make a thorough study of all the influences that are in any way inimical to the best interests of inter-collegiate sport and threaten its very existence, this committee to report at the next Convention."

To acquaint those who are here for the first time, and to refresh the memory of others, permit us to enumerate briefly some of the actions of the N. C. A. A. during the past few years which relate directly to the matters entrusted to this committee.

At the annual Convention in December, 1933, as an outgrowth of round-table discussions of previous years, a committee of five was appointed to make a study and formulate a code defining, if possible, "legitimate" and "illegitimate" procedures in recruiting and subsidizing. A code stating what is justifiable and what is unjustifiable was prepared and presented by this committee of five to the delegates of the 1934 Convention, and was adopted at that time. In 1935 Secretary Nicolson prepared a questionnaire containing the provisions stipulated by the code as being unjustifiable. This questionnaire was sent to the presidents of 150 member institutions, with the request that information be furnished as to whether the institution agreed in theory with the provisions of the code, and also whether these same provisions were actually being observed in the athletic policies of the institution. The replies were presented to those present at the convention of 1935, in the form of a report submitted by the Secretary, and later were mailed with Convention reports to all member institutions.

In reference largely to this same matter the delegates in the annual Convention one year ago unanimously adopted a resolution stating:

(1) "The N. C. A. A. reaffirms its unalterable adherence to the principles and practice of strict amateurism in the administra-

tion of inter-collegiate athletics," and

(2) "Regrets that the recognized and inherent difficulties in enforcing amateur rules should ever be responsible for leading any of its members to compromise these principles."

This same resolution also called for the appointment of a committee of three to perform the functions already outlined in the introduction of this report which we are now presenting.

However, before presenting the body of our report, may we digress a few moments to say that we have made as exhaustive a study as possible in every section of the country in connection with the matters coming under our responsibility. The information we received came from those in whom we believe, in whom we have confidence and faith, individuals who are reliable and who are on the firing-line in all the districts of the Association.

Furthermore, we have seen fit to present our findings in the briefest possible manner. It will be generally realized that we are dealing with highly controversial problems, each one of which might well call for long descriptions both philosophical and factual in character. We feel, however, that the delegates at this Convention are quite thoroughly posted on the arguments both pro and con with respect to these problems. This again encourages your committee to employ brevity which otherwise might seem inconsiderate in the presentation of its findings.

And now may we present the conclusions of your committee:

First: The committee reports that in its opinion the provisions of the code on recruiting and subsidizing are adequate, and that changes in the wording are unnecessary. Your committee has the conviction that this code embodies the principles that should govern the membership of the N. C. A. A. with respect to the problems of recruiting and subsidizing. As a matter of fact, your committee has little patience with those who would criticize this code either on the score of its provisions or upon the score of its terminology. It is the spirit of the code which counts most, and quibbling about the wording is of no consequence. The fundamental principles involved in the problems of recruiting and subsidizing are known to all of those close to the conduct of inter-collegiate athletics. Your committee feels that the fundamentals are included in the code as it stands. With respect to the wording of the code, we report finding no glaring ambiguities and submit that no piece of writing can satisfy all critics with respect to the terminology employed.

Second: Your committee now reports in connection with the second item of its responsibility, namely, on those influences which it believes to be detrimental to the best interests of inter-collegiate athletics.



(1) First and foremost we place recruiting and subsidizing. In making the study your committee felt that any factor which tends to distort the true purpose of amateur inter-collegiate athletics and which tends to destroy its natural educational relationship to the institution is inimical to the best interests of inter-collegiate sports. Our exhaustive study has convinced us that on the whole these practices constitute our most pressing problem. Your committee is convinced that this is a matter which can not be met by any half-way measures, such as condoning it, or such as legalizing it by conference action, as has been done in certain parts of the country. Your committee is convinced as a result of its research that conditions have not improved with respect to recruiting and subsidizing during the past few years. Two years ago the N. C. A. A. established a code of good practice with reference to this problem. The Association by its very nature has no police power. It is the responsibility of each individual institution to correct its own shortcomings. The Association's code but points the path to follow. This situation presents, in the opinion of your committee, the strongest of challenges to the fundamental common-sense and integrity of the administrators of our colleges, and when we say administrators we include coaches, directors of athletics, faculty athletic committees, conference officials, college and university presidents, and boards of trustees.

(2) The committee is opposed to post-season football games of all descriptions, including so-called "bowl games", feeling that they have no part in the athletic programs of the colleges. We believe this to be so because such games serve no sound educational ends, and such promotions merely trade upon inter-collegiate football for commercial purposes.

(3) The committee opposes the playing of amateur-professional football games such as have developed in the last few years. We have no quarrel with professional football, but at the same time we believe inter-collegiate football should be entirely divorced from it and should have no part with it, and that institutions which have the well-being of inter-collegiate football at heart should prevent their coaches and other members of their staffs from participating in such games.

(4) The committee deplores the growth of gambling in connection with inter-collegiate sports and believes that the colleges should recognize frankly the dangers inherent in this situation. We believe that the increase in this type of gambling is but another phase of the general increase in the volume of gambling on all sports. We recommend that coaches of college teams and all others associated with the

conduct of college sports should be restrained from making public statements containing forecasts of probable sports results. We make this recommendation because we believe, first, that it is not becoming for those concerned with the conduct of inter-collegiate sports to attempt to prophesy the probable outcome of contests beyond those in which they are immediately concerned, and second, because such prophesies or forecasts give further stimulation to the urge to gamble.

(5) We view with apprehension the tendency in some quarters for members of inter-collegiate sports staffs to participate in commercial broadcasts in which the good names of the colleges and college sports are traded upon for the sales promotion of products. Your committee considers this development as but another instance of the intrusion of outside influences and activities in matters which are entirely the concern of the colleges, and believes that this practice should be eliminated.

(6) Your committee believes that all will agree that drinking at athletic contests is detrimental to the best interests of inter-collegiate sports, and feels that all institutions should continually exercise all possible means to curtail this practice. We are happy to report that in our opinion in certain parts of the country there has been a distinct improvement in this situation.

(7) Faculty control of athletics has of late been threatened in some quarters by outside influences which have sought to grasp control of sports with every indication of conducting them on a basis detrimental to their welfare. The committee condemns this practice and believes that the N. C. A. A. should go on record as being opposed to any such movement.

Your committee feels that with the exception of recruiting and subsidizing no one of the other items may in itself be of such importance in scope as to bring about the downfall of inter-collegiate athletics. However, so many outside influences have injected themselves into our inter-collegiate sports that the sum total of the other enumerated items represents a real threat to the existence of inter-collegiate sport on an amateur basis. Your committee believes that these influences and activities should be combated every step of the way.

Those who are studying the problem of inter-collegiate athletics and who are seeking remedies for its shortcomings are not reformers. Rather, in the opinion of your committee, they are conservationists endeavoring to preserve American college sports, with particular reference to football, and to maintain its amateur status, which comprises the only status upon which reputable



colleges will permit the sports to be played in the inter-collegiate competitive athletic programs. Anyone associated with the conduct of inter-collegiate athletics who thinks otherwise will some day meet with a rude awakening. There can be no question but that colleges which seriously regard their educational responsibilities and their custodianship of ideals and truth will drop a sport rather than submit to its professionalization. Those in coaching and administrative positions identified with college sports, and with college football in particular, had better sense this truth immediately, if for no other than selfish reasons, because by exploiting the sports and the participants in the direction of professionalism they are shortening the span of life of their own profession and means of livelihood.

Your committee holds to the opinion that no one organization, conference, or association of colleges is capable by mass action of eliminating such detrimental tendencies and practices as have been enumerated which are doing so much to destroy the proper character and quality of inter-collegiate sports. With proper and adequate standards established by associations such as the National Collegiate Athletic Association, it is the duty and responsibility of every college to correct its own shortcomings.

PHILIP O. BADGER,  
New York University

H. H. KING,  
Kansas State College

Z. G. CLEVENGER, *Chairman*,  
Indiana University

### III. ON ELIGIBILITY TO N. C. A. A. MEETS

Two cases were formally placed before the Committee which were concerned with the eligibility for the N. C. A. A. Track and Field Meet of 1936. Both were cases of students who had transferred from junior colleges to senior, who had participated in intercollegiate athletics while in the junior college, had transferred to the senior college without obeying the one year residence rule, and desired to participate for a fourth year. According to the notice which had been sent out in advance, announcing that such students would not be eligible, the Committee ruled that they were ineligible.

Many other inquiries were received by the Committee from institutions to which athletes had transferred without obeying the one year residence rule and who had participated in inter-collegiate athletics during their junior college period. All institutions accepted the ruling of the Committee in good grace, but it was evident that the subject was one which required considera-

tion by the Association. As had been proposed, a round table discussion of the subject was announced and was held in the Tea Room of the Hotel Pennsylvania, at 2 p. m., December 28th, 1936. The following is a resume of the proceedings; a verbatim report will be found in the Appendix.

#### *Conference on the Junior College Student Who Transfers to a Senior College and His Eligibility for Varsity Intercollegiate Competition*

An opening statement by the Chairman of the purpose of the round table discussion was followed by statements by Professor H. C. Willett, of the University of Southern California, which gave conditions in and regulations of the Pacific Coast Conference which permits transfers from junior colleges to compete on the same conditions as those who were resident students at the same time.

Professor H. H. King, of Kansas State College, related the experience of "The Big Six" which requires transfers to obey the one year residence rule before competing in intercollegiate sports contests. The Missouri Valley Conference passed a regulation that junior college transfers might continue sports competition without obeying the one year transfer rule. "The Big Six" refused to play teams with such transfer students eligible with the result that about half the institutions in the Missouri Valley Conference enforced the one year transfer rule.

Professor Franklin, of the University of Colorado, by letter, and Professor Nelson, of the University of Denver, described conditions and practices in the Rocky Mountain Conference which are similar in general to those of the Pacific Coast Conference, but with differences.

Professor E. W. McDiarmid, President of the Southwestern Conference, stated in a letter that the Southwestern Conference charged the junior transfer student with one year of participation in the senior college for each two years of athletic competition in the junior college, effective in September, 1937. He says: "There is still some question in our minds about the wisdom of this concession" that transfers from junior colleges should be permitted to compete immediately on transfer.

Professor McDiarmid's personal view conforms closely with the practice in the Pacific Coast Conference.

Professor Larson, of the University of Arizona, stated that the practice in the Border Conference was in general similar to that in the Pacific Coast Conference except that only transfers from accredited junior colleges were permitted to continue inter-collegiate competition, or participate therein without obeying the one year rule.

In general, it may be said that, except for the "Big Six" and



"Big Ten" members, colleges west of the Mississippi River are permitted by their conferences to suspend the one year residence rule for transfers from junior colleges, but with differences in details.

It seems difficult for the different conferences to approach uniformity of conditions except by negotiations extending over some time.

The point was made that conference conditions of scholastic eligibility were accepted by the N. C. A. A.—why should not the eligibility of junior college transfers be determined by the conferences? A partial answer is the generally recognized transfer rule to prevent tramp athletes. It seems reasonable to ask that the conditions be well defined and generally accepted if the transfer rule is to be abrogated for some transfer students and not for all students in institutions holding membership in the N. C. A. A.

Representatives of eastern institutions questioned the desirability of permitting students who transferred from junior to senior college to participate in intercollegiate athletics until one year had elapsed, the objections being founded largely on fears that the tramp athlete would again become a problem, since there has been little experience in the East with transfers from junior colleges on which to base a factual study.

The Pacific Coast Conference has had eight years of experience with its present plan and many more of trial and error in approaching its practice. It evaluates the eligibility of junior college students exactly as if these students had been in the senior college from the time they enrolled in the junior college.

After the adjournment of the meeting, the Committee with the aid of Professor Willett drew up the following statement which was submitted to the business meeting of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, held in the afternoon of December 29, 1936.

#### *Recommendations*

The Committee submits the following three regulations to cover the participation during 1937 of transfers from junior to senior colleges in N. C. A. A. meets.

The junior college is defined for the purposes here concerned as a college with a two year objective, which does not give a degree, and which requires graduation from an accredited high school for admission to it.

1. The one year residence rule may be waived in the case of a transfer from a junior college, *provided* that the certifying college requires as high scholastic standards of the transfer student as it requires of its resident students under similar conditions,

2. and provided that the certifying senior college counts all

athletic competition in the junior college just as if it had taken place in the certifying college itself. It is understood that any competition with a team of another school or college which the student had within twelve months following his enrollment in a junior college shall count as freshman competition.

3. That the total years of "intercollegiate" competition shall be limited to four, including the year or years of competition while in the junior college.

(The one year residence rule on transfers from degree granting institutions shall continue in force as heretofore.)

R. L. SACKETT, *Chairman*  
THOMAS E. FRENCH

The Association received the above report, including the recommendations of the Committee, and adopted the recommendations without objection.

#### IV. ON THE FEDERAL ADMISSIONS TAX

Attention is called to the fact that the committee of the Association is made up of Messrs. W. B. Owens of Stanford University, C. M. Updegraff of the State University of Iowa, Henry Rottschaefer and Frank McCormick of the University of Minnesota, and Ralph W. Aigler, Chairman, of the University of Michigan. It will be remembered that Mr. Newton D. Baker of Cleveland, Ohio has been engaged as special counsel.

The Committee was created for the purpose of lending such assistance as might be feasible and desirable in getting an authoritative decision as to the constitutionality of the Federal Admissions Tax (of 1932) under which the admissions to college athletic events, though the proceeds inure to the benefit of educational institutions, are subject to the tax. It is realized that neither the Association nor the Committee can initiate or in any proper sense be a party in any such test litigation. Litigation almost certainly would involve the United States Government and some particular institution (state or municipally supported), and in such litigation the Association and its Committee can only be of such assistance as may prove possible.

Again, it must be remembered that the contention of the state supported institutions is that the Federal Admissions Tax is beyond the powers of Congress because it amounts to a direct burden, though in terms levied upon the ticket purchasers, upon an essential governmental function of the state or a sub-division thereof. A long line of cases in the American courts have developed this constitutional point. It can arise only in a dual system of government such as ours. The states are sovereign



within their spheres and the central government is sovereign within its limited sphere. It is beyond the powers of either one, so the courts have held, to levy taxes upon the governmental activities of the other. In this phase of our problem the question is whether the Admissions Tax does amount to such a direct burden upon an essential governmental activity. Professional opinion, with which the judgment of the members of the Committee agrees, is very generally to the effect that on this point the state supported institutions have better than an even chance of winning.

There is a second angle to this problem. Even if it should be concluded by the Supreme Court that the Admissions Tax is within the powers of Congress, is it possible for Congress to compel state instrumentalities such as universities to collect taxes for the United States? It will be remembered that the Admissions Tax, while exacted from the ticket purchaser, is to be collected by the institution. Our information is distinctly to the effect that the collection of this tax costs each institution a measureable sum of money and effort. Now it may be that this tax is within the power of Congress but that Congress would have to provide for its own tax collectors. The Committee have been advised by federal tax collectors that the collection by the institutions is the only practicable method of collection. These collectors seem to be distinctly of the opinion that if it should be decided that the institutions cannot be compelled to make the collections, the tax is practically uncollectible. In other words, if the case is lost on the first ground but won on the second, the result in either case is in substance the freeing of these universities from this tax.

Most of the universities have collected the tax during the last five years and paid it to the United States. Questions are frequently asked as to whether there is any chance of recovering such payments, in case it should be decided that the tax is unconstitutional. Until recently it was thought that even if it should be finally decided that the tax is beyond the powers of Congress to levy, a suit to recover back payments made, if the suit is by the university, would fail. A recent decision, however, of the United States Court of Claims (to which attention was called in an Association Bulletin sent out in November) indicates that if the universities prevail on the first point, namely, that the tax is beyond the powers of Congress to levy, then the institutions that have collected the tax and paid it over may recover back such payments.

Congress, however, has provided a four year statute of limitations for such refunds, and any claims for refund must be filed within four years from the time the payment sought to be recovered was made.

There is only one court, the Supreme Court of the United

States, that is in position to repudiate the doctrine of the Court of Claims. The whole matter in this respect may be summed up as follows. If the Supreme Court decides that the Admissions Tax is beyond the constitutional powers of Congress to levy, and if the Supreme Court of the United States does not repudiate the doctrine of the Court of Claims, state supported institutions may reasonably expect to recover back payments collected and made within the four years of the time the claim for refund is filed.

In order to avoid any misapprehension, let it be said specifically that if the universities prevail only on the second ground, namely, that it is beyond the powers of Congress to compel state agencies to collect federal taxes, this matter of refund drops out of the picture.

There are three lawsuits pending in which the constitutionality of the tax is questioned: one in Georgia, one in Iowa, and one in Minnesota. All three of these cases may possibly raise the question as to the powers of Congress to levy the tax. If any one of the three will raise the other question as to the power of Congress to compel a state university to act as tax collector, it would be the Georgia case. (Since the oral report was given on December 29th the United States District Judge in Georgia has ruled that state universities in conducting intercollegiate athletics, including football, are engaged in an essential governmental function, and that therefore the Federal Admissions Tax is invalid as to such events.) The members of the Committee are not inclined to advise member institutions as to what their courses of action should be. Each institution should consult its own counsel as to the proper course of procedure. The Committee members feel that they have done their duty in this respect when they put the facts and possibilities before the members.

RALPH W. AIGLER,  
*Chairman.*



## ADDRESSES

### I. PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

MAJOR JOHN L. GRIFFITH

A year ago today the delegates at the Thirtieth Annual Convention of the National Collegiate Athletic Association asked me to continue for another year as administrative officer of this Association. It has been a great pleasure to be associated with the men who are carrying on the work of the N. C. A. A. I have enjoyed meeting with the members of the Executive Committee and the Council, have had the privilege of consulting with the chairmen of the various rules committees, the chairmen of our other committees, the district representatives, and further have talked and corresponded with a number of college and university presidents, faculty representatives, athletic directors and coaches. It is a rare privilege to serve as president of this great organization. Holding such an office makes it possible for the incumbent in the office to understand pretty well the attitudes of college men throughout the country toward intercollegiate athletics, the problems that arise in the different districts, and the progress that is being made by the universities and colleges.

I thank you from the bottom of my heart for this rich experience which has been mine and at the same time remind you that the work of the Association is performed by nearly 200 men who have served as officers, members of committees, or in other capacities, as well as by the college men generally who are ever ready to give of their time and help for the good of the game. Some may think of the Association in terms of our annual Convention. The Convention is important, of course, because it brings us together, gives us a chance to discuss formally and informally matters of common interest, and above all makes it possible for us to become acquainted, but the men who work through the year in different capacities really serve the cause of college athletics more abundantly than anyone else.

You will read, no doubt, the reports of the various committees, but may I in a few minutes time attempt to paint a picture of the working parts of this great organization.

The members of the Executive Committee have met as usual several times during the year. You have read the reports of the actions taken by your committee in the *Bulletins* that Dean Nicolson has prepared and distributed from time to time. Some of the

men who have attended these meetings have traveled a considerable distance and have made something of a sacrifice that they might perform their N. C. A. A. duties faithfully and well. No board of directors of any corporation, of any university, or of any educational foundation can possibly have given more serious thought to the problems confronting them than have the members of your Executive Committee this past year given to the work of the N. C. A. A.

This year we were fortunate in having an unusually large number of strong men serving as district vice-presidents. I have always felt that the administrative work of this organization should in so far as possible be decentralized. The responsibility should more and more be carried by the men appointed to represent the various districts. Next year the district vice-presidents, and your incoming president as well, will be given a travel allowance. The thought is that thus each representative may visit the institutions in his district, consult with the presidents and faculty men, tell them about the work of the N. C. A. A., and solicit the wholehearted support and coöperation of all.

The work of the various rules committees of course falls most heavily on the shoulders of the chairmen of these respective committees. Especially is this the case if the man in question is chairman of a rules committee that has to do with a sport on the Olympic program. Our representatives on the Olympic Games Committees were largely drawn from the personnel that composed the rules committees. To give you an idea of the work done by the chairman of such a committee, it has been estimated that Professor Frederick W. Luehring, chairman of the N. C. A. A. Swimming Rules Committee and also chairman of the Olympic Wrestling Committee, this last year spent more than 1,000 hours in carrying on his work. For instance, in connection with the rules committee he wrote 170 letters, compiled four reports, attended three committee meetings and three championship meets. As chairman of the Olympic Swimming Committee he wrote 350 letters, compiled five reports, and devoted 240 hours to the financial campaign and 300 hours in attending committee meetings and final try-outs. Further, as a member of the American Olympic Committee he attended five meetings in New York, and in all spent some 70 hours in fulfilling his obligations as one of our representatives on this important committee. Mention might be made of the fact that the rules committee, following the championship meet at Harvard, was in session all night, which meant that these men spent 24 hours without stopping in completing their necessary work.

Mr. T. N. Metcalf, chairman of the N. C. A. A. Track and Field Rules Committee and a member of the Olympic Track and Field Games Committee, reports that the members of the rules committee spent four days in attending the meeting of the com-



mittee and the N. C. A. A. Meet. Each of these men spent considerable time at home in preparing the material for the Guide, in contacting the coaches and others in his district, in interpreting rules, etc. Mr. Bingham, who as our representative served as chairman of the Olympic Track Games Committee, probably spent at least one-half of his time for the first six months of this year, and Mr. Metcalf perhaps devoted fully as much time to his work as chairman of the N. C. A. A. Track and Field Committee as well as a member of the Olympic Track and Field Games Committee.

Dr. C. A. Beling, chairman of the Gymnastic Rules Committee, reports that the N. C. A. A. men who were members of the Olympic Gymnastic Committee and also members of the N. C. A. A. Rules Committee, gave more time to their work this last year than have the men who have served in similar capacities in other years. Dr. Clapp further, in addition to being chairman of the Wrestling Rules Committee, was secretary of the American Olympic Wrestling Games Committee. He was largely responsible for the arrangements for the seventeen district semi-final wrestling try-outs, and as well carried on negotiations for the final try-outs. In this connection, attention should be called to the fact that stenographic work done by the members of our various committees is usually contributed by the universities and in a great many cases when our members have attended different kinds of meetings their expenses have been paid by their own institutions or by themselves.

Mr. Hugo Bezdek, chairman of the N. C. A. A. Boxing Committee, held five meetings during the past year, spent approximately one month's time in helping to promote the N. C. A. A. Boxing Tournament, and further he and the others rendered valuable assistance in connection with their Olympic duties.

Mr. Albert I. Prettyman, chairman of the Ice Hockey Committee, was a member of the Olympic Ice Hockey Games Committee, made many trips to the various meetings, and gave an almost unbelievable amount of time in carrying on the work incident to his various official duties.

Professor H. W. Clark and the members of the Association Football Rules Committee held the usual number of meetings, prepared the material for the Rules Book, and assisted in the work of the Olympic Soccer Games Committee.

Mr. Walter Okeson, chairman of the N. C. A. A. Football Rules Committee, in addition to conducting the annual meeting which was this last year held in California, attended a great many rules interpretation meetings, answered countless questions regarding interpretations of the rules, and devoted a tremendous amount of time to the interests of the game that he so ably represents.

Since some may not be familiar with the many aspects relating

to the selection and work of the Football Rules Committee, I would like to have the following appear in the records. The terms of office of the members of this important committee are staggered. Two new men are selected each year. The nominations are made by the Committee to Nominate Committees, which committee is composed of a representative from each of the eight N. C. A. A. districts. Before the committee reaches a decision the district man where a vacancy occurs is expected to canvass the opinions of the men in his district and to report his findings to Professor French's committee. After the committee has been selected in the annual Convention and before the meeting of the rules committee, each district representative canvasses the coaches, officials, and others in his district and attends the meeting as a representative, in the full sense of the word, of the N. C. A. A. men in his district. This is a thoroughly democratic arrangement. The men selected are invariably persons who have reached the age of mature judgment, who have but one thought and that is the safeguarding and improvement of the game of football.

The Basketball Rules Committee, under the chairmanship of Professor L. W. St. John, has held numerous meetings this past year, and the men who served on the Olympic Basketball Games Committee attended some twelve meetings, conducted the sectional final try-outs, and all in all spent weeks of their time and for the most part paid their expenses to the meetings. Mr. St. John drove from Columbus, Ohio, to New York City to attend at least five or six meetings of his committee and further conducted a number of interpretation meetings.

I have not mentioned all of the rules committees, as I do not want to consume too much of your time. I do want to impress, however, upon the members of this Association that those who are serving us on these various important committees have devoted an unbelievable amount of time and work to their specific jobs. I feel that a member on a rules committee representing his district is more than a legislator appointed to help revise the rules annually and to assist in compilation of the data for the guide books, but further he is an ambassador in his district whose duty is that of studying the sport that he represents and of constantly seeking means of improving and promoting the game in question. Through the years this Association has been very careful in its selection of the personnel of these various committees. May I suggest that we continue to select in the future the best men available, and further that we look to each member as the official representative of the sport in his district.

In addition to the various rules committees may I briefly call attention to the work of some of our special committees. Professor R. W. Aigler, as chairman of the Committee on the Admissions Tax, has through the year with the help of the mem-



bers of his committee kept in close touch with the various cases that have been brought to trial, has passed on his opinions regarding the legal aspects of the matter involved, has made many trips to consult others regarding the work incident to this committee, and all in all has rendered invaluable service to the colleges of America.

Dean Sackett, chairman of the Committee on Eligibility, together with the other members, has faithfully performed the duties of his office, as you will see after reading his annual report. Before the N. C. A. A. began the practice of conducting championship meets there was no need of a Committee on Eligibility, but now that we have these meets annually someone must rule respecting the eligibility of the athletes who compete in the several meets.

Professor Z. G. Clevenger, Professor Badger, and Professor King have in a most painstaking manner attempted to ascertain the facts regarding the troublesome matter of recruiting and subsidizing of athletes. No group of men has ever given more careful thought and attention to this question than has this committee, whose report you will I am sure read with a great deal of interest.

Professor Clarence M. Updegraff, chairman of the committee, and Professor H. C. Willett and Professor R. A. Fetzner, have during the year been making a careful study of the radio broadcasting question. Every innovation affecting athletics brings new problems. We are indebted to the members of this committee for the work that they have done.

Mr. Frank McCormick served most ably as chairman of the N. C. A. A. Committee for raising money among the colleges for the Olympic Games. No one ever worked harder, or gave more time to an Association assignment than did Mr. McCormick and the men who so loyally assisted him.

Professor Thomas E. French as chairman of the Committee to Nominate Committees has served in this capacity for a number of years. In many respects his is the most exacting task of all those assumed by our N. C. A. A. workers. This fall, for instance, he compiled an outline of the duties of the committee, and asked each member of the committee to give close attention to the job and to report to the chairman. The Committee has spent considerable time this week in preparing their recommendations which will be submitted to the Convention this afternoon.

Mr. Romeyn Berry has, I understand, been meeting with the members of his Committee to Nominate Officers and has, as is customary I am sure, written a great many letters to men scattered throughout the United States.

Dr. Joseph E. Raycroft, vice-president of the American Olympic Committee and one of the men who has served this Association for thirty-one years, this last year, in addition to the time

given to the Olympic Committee and as a member of the Executive Committee of the N. C. A. A., has been in charge of our publications. No man, with the possible exception of Dean Nicolson and General Pierce, has given so much valuable thought and assistance to the N. C. A. A. as has Dr. Raycroft.

I have waited until the last to mention in brief the work done by our beloved Secretary and Treasurer. Dean Nicolson through all the years has served this Association faithfully, honestly, and intelligently. If I were to venture to list the Dean's outstanding characteristics they would be these: his faith in the educational ideal and his insistence that intercollegiate athletics should be an asset rather than a liability to an educational institution; his good sense and sound judgment; and finally his infectious good humor. I will not attempt to tell you how many hours the Dean spends each year in keeping the machinery of this Association moving but if anyone thinks that the N. C. A. A. does not function between meetings I would suggest that a visit to the Dean's study in Middletown would disabuse him of that idea.

A recital of the work done by the officers and committees of the Association is no doubt tedious and tiresome to the listeners, but I hope the presidents, faculty men, and others who read the reports contained in our annual Proceedings will as a result of this part of my report realize, in part at least, how much work the men of our organization annually do.

May I now review with you briefly the past year in college athletics. I need not mention the fact that materially conditions have vastly improved in the last twelve months. Many new athletic buildings and stadia have been built, or old ones improved, and more men are engaged in carrying on the work of the athletic departments today than were likewise engaged a year ago. In fact, most of the colleges and universities that are members of this Association now maintain well rounded programs of athletics and physical education. In a well rounded program a boy who is physically sub-normal finds helpful ministrations in the medical department. The lad of average athletic ability, and the boy as well who perhaps does not care to try for one of the varsity teams, finds his interests conserved by the intramural department. The student of superior athletic attainments is given an opportunity of competing against men of like ability under the direction of the intercollegiate department. In former years it was often suggested, at least by implication, that it was necessary to neglect one of these groups in order to care properly for the members of the other two groups. This idea, however, is seldom now advanced.

The question of illegitimate subsidizing of athletes is not new. On November 2, 1899, there appeared in a newspaper under a New York date line the following statement: "There will be a lively meeting of the Intercollegiate Football Association at the



Fifth Avenue Hotel next Monday. The question of professionalism will be settled." I am sorry that the gentlemen who attended this meeting failed to settle the question, but the fact is I do not expect to live to see it settled. It is surprising, however, how many men each year suddenly discover that our college athletics are not 100% amateur. A nationally known university president some time ago suggested that perhaps college athletics were about 85% all right. I think I called attention last year to the fact that we cannot measure scientifically the honesty and integrity of the legal or medical profession, of the men at the heads of some 400,000 business corporations, of the politicians, or in fact of the school teachers, college professors, or newspaper writers. I am sure, however, we will all agree that none of these groups are 100% perfect. Further, I am sure that no one can with any accuracy maintain that college athletics are more or less professional today than they were, let us say, fifty years ago. My own opinion, and it is only an opinion, is that there are fewer boys per thousand today being illegitimately subsidized in our colleges than was true twenty-five or fifty years ago.

Of course we have a professional problem. No one whom I know who has any knowledge of the situation has ever denied the fact that some college athletes in any given year have been paid for playing on their respective teams.

What I am interested in is the question of what we can do about it. One man suggests that there is nothing that we can do. I told him, however, that the ministers were still preaching against sin, that men are arrested every day on charges of burglary and murder, that some of the penitentiaries number among their inmates men who formerly occupied pulpits. Nevertheless, society cannot afford to relax its vigilance against those who practice crime, selfishness, and greed.

Others have suggested that the Carnegie Foundation conduct another study for the purpose of revealing the fact that our college athletics are not perfect. Personally I doubt whether it is necessary for any fact finding foundation to spend the time and money to tell us that which we already know. The colleges in a given district know which ones of their members use ringers and paid athletes. There is no one, however, who can force these colleges that do not wish to maintain athletics on a paid player basis to schedule games with those that do use mercenaries.

Some would like to shirk their own responsibilities by passing the responsibility on to the National Collegiate Athletic Association to police the colleges of America. We have repeatedly pointed out that there is nothing this Association can do for an individual college that the presidents and the members of the faculty of that institution cannot do for themselves.

Still others suggest that if the standards were lowered and if the colleges would openly subsidize their athletes just a little bit,

then all hypocrisy would disappear. There is no reason to believe, however, that if a college conference legitimized the practice of paying athletes at the rate of \$50 a week there would not be some who would now and then raise the ante. Is there anyone so naive as to believe that if the laws provided that it would be a felony to steal \$100 or more (in other words it would be all right to steal \$90), there would no longer be any major thefts committed?

The idea has frequently been advanced this last year that the profits from the games should be divided among the athletes. So far as I know these suggestions have not come from the athletes themselves. College athletics could not long endure if this practice generally were followed. Can you imagine the students and alumni being enthusiastic about a team of paid gladiators, or can you imagine any self-respecting Board of Trustees, president, or faculty who would long be able to justify the practice of hiring football players to entertain the public? After all, if a boy wants to play professional football there are plenty of opportunities open to him. There is no reason why the colleges should be asked to pay their players so as to give such a lad a chance to capitalize on his athletic skill.

Some college presidents have demonstrated the fact that they can maintain athletics in their institutions on an amateur basis. Others can do the same if they are so disposed, and if they have the requisite amount of courage.

Before I close may I say a word about the college interests in the Olympic Games. I feel that under the administration of the chairman of the American Olympic Association, Mr. Avery Brundage, and the men who served on the different committees, our participation was wholesome and very much worth while. The colleges whole-heartedly supported the Olympic Committee by supplying the men who helped as members of the different committees, by contributing money, and by providing most of the outstanding athletes who participated in sports that are on the college program. Since the Olympic constitution was re-written, however, this was the first time that the colleges have been given a fair representation on the track and field, swimming, wrestling, and other games committees that have to do with college sports. The fact remains that the president of the A. A. U. could, if he saw fit, appoint nine out of the thirteen members of these important games committees. I suggest that, if the colleges are to continue their support of the Olympic Games, this situation should be corrected.

In conclusion, I wish to thank you gentlemen for your kind patience in listening to this rather dry report, and further I want to thank you and all the others who have been responsible for whatever success this administration has enjoyed.



## II. PRESIDENT RALPH C. HUTCHISON, WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE

It is a curious thing that the question of subsidization should attract so much attention when it is an insignificant result of far more serious evils which exist in the football world. Were some of these greater evils corrected, the problems attendant upon the subsidization of athletes would disappear. It is my purpose this morning to analyse these greater sins and show if possible how they are related to amateurism and subsidization.

The original sin, I believe, in football is ignorance of its significance and consequent disregard of its importance by those who should assume responsibility. It is as though a child of great ability were totally neglected by its parents and by society. Growing thus into a social monster it is condemned by the very people who are responsible for its neglect and evil development. Football has a similar history.

Let us consider the significance of, and justification for, the game of football in the American college. We have generally assumed that it is part of the physical education of the college youth. A brief analysis would indicate that it does not qualify as such. In the first place, too small a percentage of college men are permitted, or even willing, to participate. If ten per cent in a small college or one per cent in a great university participate in football the percentage is good. Even this percentage is false, because many of those who play are non-indigenous importations who have come for the purpose. In the second place football cannot qualify as physical education because it is only made available to those who do not need it. The weaklings, the hesitant, the repressed, the sickly, are not welcomed to the football field. Those who do play, on the other hand, come to college magnificently developed, with muscles of iron, chests like barrels, necks and shoulders that would do credit to Greek wrestlers. They do not need football. Frequently they are already burnt out by too much football. They need more than anything else four years of complete rest. In the third place football does not qualify as physical education because of the many and serious injuries sustained. Any poll of old football men will bring out ample evidence that they carry injuries which would not be a credit to any system of physical education. For these reasons football is not justified as physical education.

Another justification which is often made for football is its advertising value to the college. Facts and figures dispute this heartily. Several studies have illustrated the fact that over the

past twenty-five years the big-time football colleges have actually lost ground in comparison with those which have been noted for intellectual and spiritual emphases. To the large universities football apparently makes little difference. To the small college a great team is sometimes a detriment because of the assumption over the nation that a small college with such a great team has necessarily gone "football" to the sacrifice of all for which a good college should stand. Football brings fame, but such fame usually does not bring gifts, students, or general support.

While these and other claims for football would seem to us to be invalid, it does not follow that football is without significance. Football is here to stay, not because of the values usually attributed to it but because of another and greater value harder to define. Football may not serve the body, or the mind, or the college treasury, but it does serve the emotions. Football is the emotional center of college life. It is the rallying point for the loyalties of students, alumni, and friends not only of the individual college but of all of the culture for which the college stands. Football is the flag which the college unfurls and around which are drawn the emotions and loyalties of all who follow. It is the point of emotional integration on the campus. About the teams and the games are gathered all the enthusiasms, the deeper loyalties, and the otherwise unreleased feelings which make college life so much more meaningful in America than it is in most other countries of the world.

The striking thing about this emotional phenomenon is that it has arisen in an educational system which tends to train the intellect and overlook the emotions. One prominent educator has been pointing out that our education trains the mind but leaves the all-important emotional development to Hollywood. Nevertheless, spontaneously, students and alumni have developed a much-needed emotional integration for the campus which is therefore of tremendous significance and which should be so recognized by the educators. The force of the movement has resulted in thousands of teams, innumerable stadia, the expenditure of millions of dollars, and a force and momentum which threatens at times to overshadow the intellectual phase of education.

The true significance of football has at no time in its history been recognized by the educators. They have persisted in looking upon it as a necessary evil and leaving its destinies to the direction of alumni associations, athletic associations, and to directors and coaches who were excluded from the inner educational circles. Herein is the crime against football—that an emotional phenomenon of the greatest educational significance has been left in the hands of outsiders, that college presidents and trustees have let it go its own way, that faculties have been



ball has been compelled to manage itself and grow without the excluded from intelligent participation in control, and that foot-educational leadership to which it was entitled. The coaches, alumni, and directors did remarkably well. They were not organized or trained to handle a force of such emotional and psychological significance. Nor had they adequate authority within the college. The excesses, irregularities, and evils which have resulted must, in my judgment, be laid directly at the doors of the college presidents, the trustees, and the faculties who missed the significance of football and left its destiny to others who were in no position to handle it. Under the circumstances it is a miracle that football has been handled so well.

This brings me to my main point—that football is of such significance that it deserves to be taken back into the colleges and universities as part and parcel of the educational project. It deserves the leadership of the best the university has to offer. The evils of football will not be corrected as long as athletic associations and directors and coaches are left to do the job. They cannot do it. Subsidization is a small problem which will be cleaned up over night when and if the college presidents and trustees and faculties sense the importance of football and give it their unstinting leadership. Until that happens, and as long as presidents and chancellors and others say, "I know nothing about it"—just so long must we beat our heads against a stone wall.

The second great evil in college football is deceit. All other problems of subsidizing, gambling, drinking are small in comparison with this one of academic dishonesty in high places. The subtle development of this dishonesty is amazing. Its ramifications have spread through players, coaches, directors, presidents, and trustees. Of those universities and colleges now subsidizing players, only a negligible proportion, if any, will admit it openly, frankly, or honestly. Football from the beginning having been denied its place in the collegiate sun, developing extraneously, it has developed more or less deceitfully. Subsidizing has always been done deceitfully. Money raised from alumni or diverted from college funds has been secured by quiet covert methods. In some cases college or university presidents have insisted that they be kept in ignorance of which was going on—a despicable device. Alumni groups or stadium corporations or athletic associations often exist merely to conceal methods which the university would not care to use under its own direct control. Players receive offers of jobs, direct pay, or other benefits, and with the stipulation that they are not to reveal the source of their good fortune. Colleges refuse to publish the facts concerning their athletics and from beginning to end there is a conspiracy of deceitfulness which is absolutely incompatible with the lowest

ideals of education. The famous Carnegie Foundation report was notable not because of what it revealed, but of what it failed to reveal. That an able foundation could spend so much and get so little is evidence of the silence and concealment in which the whole business is shrouded.

A striking illustration of this dishonesty occurred in the Middle States Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges. Several years ago this association took action to the effect that colleges awarding athletic scholarships would be removed from accredited standing. From the beginning the committee took the position that they were not a police force, and that certainly the presidents and chancellors could be trusted to be honest. This proved a tragic assumption. The method of the committee was to give each president ample warning that they would, on a certain date, ask him for a simple statement as to whether athletic scholarships existed in his institution. In the meantime it was his business to find out, if "he did not know". The first such statement was asked for in October of 1933. Within this area there were notoriously subsidized teams, yet to the amazement of all, every single college and university presented a letter signed by its president or chancellor stating on his honor that, save for certain temporary exceptions allowed by the association, there was neither subsidizing nor athletic scholarships. In 1934 the great travesty was repeated, and the Middle States was pure—not one athletic scholarship east of the Ohio line. The chairman of the committee made his report, and then laying his paper down said, very simply, that despite this report the committee was convinced that there was more subsidizing than ever before. The effort of the Middle States Association was finally abandoned, and I was informed that it was because of the obvious dishonesty of the statements of some of the college presidents which made impossible any progress by the association.

Here is the second great evil of football—the habit of dishonesty which grew up about it and which has insinuated its way into the thinking of coaches, directors, faculties, presidents, and trustees, otherwise men of reasonable honor and decency. Under these circumstances it is absurd to talk of a little problem such as subsidization. Give us some straight thinking and a little unequivocal honesty and the minor problems will be solved in no time. Continue this lying deceit about football and its scholarships and its subsidizations and its contributions to students and its coaches' salaries—and no problem will be solved. Three years of absolute honesty would solve problems of thirty years standing.

The third great evil in football is its commercialization. This is again the fault of the colleges. They have insisted that football be self-supporting, or that it even support other sports. That



any element in the educational experience should be based upon its commercial attractiveness is a fundamental violation of every principle of education. The Greek Department is not in the university because it pays. It is there whether it pays or not. The university does not know or care whether it pays its own way. It is there because of its educational validity.

So should football be included, because of its value as an emotional force in the lives of students and as an integrating power on the campus and among the alumni. If it has value it should be supported for this purpose, and at no time should it be asked to render itself commercially attractive. In the planning of schedules the financial element should not enter into consideration. The schedule should be right for the accomplishment of the highest purposes of football. Nothing else should be considered. So long as money considerations enter, football will be guilty of many sins. So long as football must pay, institutions will subsidize in the desperate hope that it may pay.

Having recognized the basic evils of football, let us turn briefly to a problem which has resulted, namely the subsidization of athletes. The subsidization of players was from the first logical and perhaps inevitable. Football was the flag of the college, and that flag must wave proudly. Furthermore there was until recently the delusion that football was profitable advertising for a college. Hence a good team was needed. For several reasons the necessary players were not and are not now available in the average student body. Inducements were therefore necessary to gather together the men who are both willing and able to play.

There are several startling reasons why the subsidization of athletes seemed necessary. From the point of view of the students it is a hard game, involving almost inevitable injury. Men are in general unwilling to pay this price unless there be some inducement. In the second place the training is long and tedious, and particularly so when fellow students are engaged in the gentle pursuits of leisure. In the third place football was being used as a money-making institution. It has not always been such, judging from the amazing list of deficits and debts which exist in football, from coast to coast. But it was a money-maker at times and was always justified and advertised as such. And what reason was there, if football was to be a commercial money-maker for the college—what reason that poor boys laboring to provide the show should not participate in the profits, at least to the extent of a college education?

But from the viewpoint of the university there were other reasons for subsidization. In the first place, it seems that almost the only men able to play football are too poor to go to college. The well-to-do boy has not been raised on his feet but in an automobile, while the poor boy still walks and thereby misses some of the enervating social activities which are peculiarly

associated with adolescence and the automobile.

Not only is the poor boy somewhat protected from the physical softening induced by the Fisher Body Corporation, but he approaches college with no hope save that held out by athletic subsidization. Added to this is the inducement of social prestige and standing which he can best win by athletic powers. Usually he is the son of immigrant parents who are miners, steel workers, or laborers of some kind. Coming from a humble home the student must earn his way through college and also win a place in the esteem and notice of his contemporaries similar to that which his wealthier classmate has by inheritance or does not need at all.

Thus it is that from our poorer and our immigrant homes come, with but rare exception, the men who are both able and willing to play football. As a result our football teams from coast to coast, in the great universities and the small colleges, are made up of Melinkoviches and Nagurskis and Chicknoskis and many others who have changed their names to Anglo-Saxon derivatives. And hail to the men who, starting with nothing but handicaps, have plunged and tackled their way to education and social advantages. Among them, owing to mal-administration, there have been some degenerates of the first order, but they prove nothing. Let us give due credit to those who have taken a beating which our Anglo-Saxon blue-bloods are unwilling to take, and who play a hard and injurious game in order that we may have our heroic banner and they an education. What might have been done with this force had our educators taken charge and led the way?

But the evils of subsidization must be admitted. Students who play football are recruited by high-pressure methods and by offers which implant in their minds a warped educational ideal. Promising athletes are sent to prep schools and given an exalted idea of their importance. Some are held out from their educational progress to ripen physically while they rot mentally. Salaries paid often exceed college expenses. Stars support home-folks and often a wife. Boys are subsidized in high school and the money laid aside for them in order that they may not seem to be paid in college, thus teaching them dishonesty. Artificial jobs with fat salaries and slim work are common, and the players, the employers, and the public know that they would never get those jobs were they not athletes. Men have been bribed from one campus to another, though this practice is, happily, passing out of the picture. The gambling fraternity has come into the picture, contaminating football as it does everything it touches—supporting players, and tampering whenever possible with the management. More serious has been the financial pampering of players, which creates in them the attitude that the



world owes them a living. Faculties have wilted under the pressure of football and in behalf of such players and have feared to flunk them. Players who cannot graduate from high school or who do not have minimum admittance credits are admitted to college. In some universities players can play their three years of varsity football without finishing the sophomore year in their studies. In some universities, players are coached by professional tutors to pass their courses by a cramming method resulting in no real education. These and many other excesses are generally known, frequently attacked and, I think, easily correctible, if and when the college authorities wake up and take charge of football, and deal with it openly, honestly, and without commercial pressure.

In conclusion I wish to say something as to subsidization in the small colleges. The whole problem will be greatly simplified if it can be recognized that there are two separate and distinct problems in subsidization. One is that of the small college and the other is that of the great university. For the small college located in the small town, as most are, subsidization is out. It is almost eliminated now throughout the country. The reason is financial. Football will not pay the costs of subsidization, no matter how good the team. High school, professional, and big-time football in the universities have taken the crowds. Football is a dead loss in the small college, and subsidization is therefore doomed, excepting in those rare cases where an "angel" will pay the bill or where the college authorities are still willing to approve the embezzlement of college funds for the purpose. And let it be said here that subsidization can be eliminated in the small college by the simple expedient of withholding from that purpose all college funds. Support from alumni for players is a delusion in the small college and rarely exists save where one man pays the bill.

The universities are in a different position. Some have what small colleges do not have, wealthy alumni willing to act as angels to athletes. They have numerous fraternities and can through those fraternities secure the support of a team. Universities are usually located in large cities and can get innumerable jobs, true or false. They can draw from those cities players who need only tuition and can stay at home for their room and board. The university therefore has a problem which is most difficult and on which I am not competent to speak.

But for the small college I think I can summarize the absolute essentials underlying a successful amateur football program. None of these principles can be omitted, or the program will break down and professionalism will return.

1. The college must take complete control of all college funds, including student fees and athletic receipts, and administer the same honestly within the regular college budget.

2. The college must realize the significance and importance of football, and take complete responsibility through its trustees, administration, and faculty.
3. The college must pay for football as it does for any other department, and remove it from all commercial pressure.
4. The schedule must be reduced to colleges similar in size and athletic standards, and within the immediate area of the college.
5. There must be no secrecy or dishonesty anywhere in the entire athletic administration.

These are the essentials to honest and clean football in the small college. They surely must contain as well the basic principles for the universities. Recognition of the value and significance of football, assumption of responsibility by the educational leaders, removal from all financial considerations and pressures, and simple honesty—these will solve subsidization anywhere, and all other football problems as well.



III. PRESIDENT JAMES L. MCCONAUGHY, WESLEYAN  
UNIVERSITY

I trust I am not being ungracious if I say that I have been dragooned into speaking on this program. I consented only because of my friendship and admiration for your Secretary, who has been my next-door neighbor for ten years. Frankly, I am dubious about the value of speeches at such conventions. One of our newspaper friends the other day quite accurately described the situation when he said of this gathering: "The ballroom of the hotel will be filled with uncomfortable chairs, and there will be a little dais on which some uncomfortable men will sit, standing now and again to make speeches in determined voices, trying to make themselves heard above the scraping of feet and chairs as the delegates wander in and out of the main room. Nothing of any great distinction is apt to happen in the main room."

Your speakers this morning are college presidents. This organization was founded by college presidents, but they have not played much part in its activities recently, and I doubt whether they will in the future. Your records show that only eleven have registered as attending during the past five years. Whatever college presidents are going to do about college athletics, particularly football, is likely to be done in gatherings, probably informal, of presidents themselves, rather than at conventions such as this. College presidents do not figure very largely at meetings of biology or history teachers. This Association is dominated by those who are giving their whole time to college athletics as directors or coaches. The college president reads the Convention Proceedings, but I do not think he is likely to act because of these meetings—all of which is said, I hope, in no ungracious spirit. Every college president, however, realizes what the Association has done in the past, and wishes "more power to its arm" in the future.

Presidential influence in college athletics is best accomplished, I think, by associations, formal or informal, of presidents. A group of representatives from twenty-six colleges, scattered geographically, but alike athletically, meet this afternoon to discuss their common problem. Every December, in Boston, the presidents of ten New England colleges, and two from New York, and two from Pennsylvania, spend a half day talking about athletics, coaches, budgets, and kindred problems; this is the most effective athletic organization with which I have any direct experience.

It will be no news to you if I say that I feel that college presidents are the ones who are responsible for the athletic standards

of their institutions. Almost any president may have in his institution the type of athletics that he and the trustees decide they want. If he has "professionalism" it is because that is what he believes is desirable. A policy of special favors for athletes does not creep into an institution unbeknownst. No president in the country, who is on his job, can avoid being held responsible for the athletic program and policies of his college.

I want to say two things this morning, quite personally—perhaps bluntly. Of course, I am speaking only for myself. A large majority of college presidents, perhaps even the two others on this program, will not agree with me. Barely possibly, I may start you thinking about what I say, whether you agree or not.

First, I want to say that I believe in football. I think it is our greatest American college game. Any discussion of college athletics naturally centers on it. As has been said by others, we are now in the period of the athletic year when criticisms and condemnations of college athletics, particularly football, are in the air. We have two seasons in football: first, September through November, for scoring; second, December, for scoring; during the first period we play the game, and during the second some of us pan the game; forward passes are the thing during the first three months, and dirty digs thereafter. I should like to quit sniping at college football. I don't want to see the game harmed by annual revision of rules, and I am rather tired of discussions of "athletic standards". I consider football our finest game, and am proud that it still is primarily a college game. Millions of Americans get their main ideas about college through football; it is unfortunate if they do not learn more, but it is better than learning nothing. The pride that a group of people, such as citizens of a state, have in their football team's prowess is worth something to us in the American college world. For Americans football takes the place of the old Roman circus. An internationally distinguished anthropologist at the Harvard Tercentenary referred to football as a "safety valve to tensions, and an adequate expression of regulated pugnacity." He was probably referring to the players, but I think the spectators, too, get from it something of value along this line. Oxford and Cambridge play their cricket matches at Lord's before society; we play our football games before millions of everyday Americans. Furthermore, in our larger institutions the profits from football usually make possible the intramural program for the non-varsity boy. Although most small colleges actually lose money on every varsity sport, the large institutions finance their programs primarily from the sale of football tickets to the public. Unless some miracle takes place, a lessening of public interest in football would mean a radical curbing of the "athletics for all" program of our big institutions. Some of you may regret that Harvard is able to pay its director of intramural athletics, with



over three thousand boys under him, only one-fifth as much as it pays the varsity coach of her thirty football players, but without the income from the games at the stadium the intramural program might be very difficult financially.

This tremendous public interest in football has one most unfortunate result which I recognize and regret, namely betting. It is too bad that such a fine game is made the excuse for wagering, millions perhaps, weekly. I do not know, however, what you and I can do about this, particularly as long as our sports editor friends begin making their guesses on Saturday's games in Tuesday's issues, and our broadcasting friends begin to fill the air with their prophecies about the score four days before the game is played.

I trust I am not being impudent or imprudent if I say that I hope the Carnegie Foundation will not again investigate college athletic standards, as the papers tell us is proposed. I am not unappreciative of the earlier Report, when I say that I do not think a second would do any good. Indeed, it is my own impression that the first resulted in a tremendous lot of publicity and talk, and very little positive action. The "immaculates" soon got bored by being praised as the Purity League, and alumni, after the team took another drubbing, urged that "no mention be made of our fine standing in the Carnegie Report!" Some colleges felt that they had been misrepresented and treated unfairly. Others frankly said that they did not care what comment the Carnegie Foundation or others made on the way in which they carried on their athletic activities.

Secondly, I should like to express a pious hope that in questions of amateur standing, proselyting, and paying athletes, we will minimize the "holier than thou" attitude and let each institution work out its own salvation in the way that seems best to it. It is my contention that a college usually has the kind of athletic program which best serves its own interests. It has the kind of athletic amateur standing which its own situation demands. Outsiders, such as you and I, will, I think, do well not to condemn, but to try to appreciate how each institution is working out its own problem. As for me, I should like to be recorded as in favor of a *laissez faire*, let well enough alone, policy on these matters. I know a lot of you will not agree with me; I only ask that you give me credit for being frank and sincere.

If an institution decides to proselyte to secure a football team, and to pay them in any way as players, it does this because it believes that the assets outweigh the liabilities of this program. If you were the president of a little college which for years had gotten its name in the sports columns only because of the number of defeats its football team had suffered, you might, to arouse alumni interest and loyalty, be willing to embark on a program of finding and producing a football team on a new basis, and the

results might quite justify your action. If you owned a great athletic stadium and a real estate firm controlling the mortgage threatened to foreclose so that you would lose it all, you might decide it was worth while to get one of the highest paid coaches in the country and allow him to "get" a team which would produce victories and crowds, and payments on your bond issue. If you were the president of a great state university, you might decide to permit what you really thought was over-emphasis of football, to win the national championship in order to promote greater pride on the part of the taxpayers in their university, more generosity from the legislature, less "sniping" by citizens at supposed campus "reds", and no infringement of academic freedom. If the bankers really controlled your college, you might decide that it was worth while for the football team to spend practically the entire time in the fall travelling and playing, letting classes go. If you wanted to build up a team which would win the Southern championship, you might be willing to tell four promising athletes in a Massachusetts city that you would see that all of their expenses were covered, even including a Ford to use for transportation to Alabama and back home. If you presided over a state teachers college that needed public support, and you felt that a good football team was the quickest and cheapest way to get this, you might secure your team without any consideration of academic standards; you might house them in a lean-to beside the gymnasium, and feed them in the girls' dormitory, and let them go back to the farms and the mines when the football season was over, and be perfectly willing to tell anyone who asked that this was the situation.

We don't expect all institutions to be alike in other matters; why should we expect it of athletic programs? After all, there is hardly any common denominator for the thousand so-called institutions of higher learning in our country. A boy can get into my college who would not pass your admissions committee. A man on your faculty would not be acceptable on ours. Costs, standards, equipment, degrees, methods of instruction—in everything we differ, and this, I think, is all to the good. Medical and law schools, and most employers, know that a B.A. means different things, depending upon the college which awarded it. For example, here are two institutions. They are entirely different in size, ideals, type of student body, and equipment. One has a stupendous plant, perhaps a veritable "temple of learning"; it has a great stadium and wants to have a hundred thousand people pay to view its contests. The other has nothing but temporary stands on its football field; the boys who come back early, to get in shape to play football, have to pay their board; there is no training table. If a boy overcuts classes, he is excluded from taking part in athletics. He gets not one cent of extra scholarship aid or special consideration for a job because he is an ath-



lete. All the students in this college get, through their tuition payment, free admission to all home contests and to certain contests away from the campus. The academic requirements for athletes are exactly the same as for other students. The schedules are made up with colleges having similar athletic programs, with no consideration of gate income. Both of these institutions are probably doing what is best for them, and I think it is ridiculous to try to classify them on any basis of superiority in athletic standards.

The University of Chicago has embarked on one of the most interesting educational experiments in the country. It is particularly interested in boys in the last two years of their course. Inevitably its athletics suffer. Apparently, it must either withdraw from the "Big Ten" or be content to take its lickings. No wonder the football captain at the annual banquet the other day said that none of their friendly rivals were educationally or athletically on the same basis as Chicago. Stevens Institute awards its scholarship aid with consideration of the leadership and participation in college activities plus grades; why shouldn't it? A fine new England technical institution proposed to give some mis-called "athletic scholarships", and was roundly berated by its academic neighbors. A professor suggested to the "Big Ten" that athletes should be given the equivalent of \$400 a year; his proposal was voted down. The Southeastern Conference a year ago announced that "athletic ability is considered in assigning scholarships, loans, and opportunities for remunerative work". Your representative in the third district, Dr. Smith of Tulane, says that this has "elevated athletics to a higher plane". The Southern Conference in the same territory has again voted absolute purity standards; the president of the conference, in recommending the abolition of this regulation, said: "Not one of the sixteen members has adhered to the spirit of the rules", and referred to the discussion of them as "idealistic prattle".

Why not agree that, as in other ways, in this, too, recognition of differences between institutions is desirable? You have had as speakers at past meetings of this Association the presidents of Notre Dame, the University of Pennsylvania, Santa Clara, and the University of Southern California. Their athletic programs differ radically from Wesleyan's. We cannot attempt to do what they do and, personally, I do not care to say that the methods they are using to carry on their athletic programs are either below or above ours.

College athletes win scholarships in every one of our institutions, and deserve them. They may be granted in part because of athletic prowess, and I doubt whether the boys are harmed thereby, or they may be based entirely upon need, marks, and promise. Even if the latter is the basis, you will find, I think, a disproportionate number of the football squad on your scholar-

ship list. In every institution football players largely come from homes of limited means; very often they are the second generation of foreign born who never could come to college, whether they played football or not, if we did not help them with scholarship aid. Candidly, the contact sports in the American college today are largely played by boys who come from homes quite unlike those that sent boys to college fifty years ago; a glance at the line-up of most American college football teams will convince you of this.

If we follow such a program of frankness, letting the other fellow work out his own salvation, minimizing rules and recognizing differences, there are a few difficulties we must face. First, colleges that wish to operate their athletics on one standard often find it difficult to find nearby opponents who conduct athletics on the same basis. Colleges in Ohio or Pennsylvania may have to contemplate rather long trips if they want to make up their schedules with colleges on similar athletic standards, rather than depend on membership in conferences of geographically related institutions. Secondly, we may frankly have to recognize a modification of our definition of the word "amateur". Amateur tennis players and Olympic performers get their expenses paid, "and then some". Have we a right to insist that a college student ceases to be an amateur athlete if his athletic ability in any way helps him financially to get through college? It does not seem to me that this demand is met in the amateur standing of amateur athletes in general; why should it be for college boys? Thirdly, care should be taken by those institutions which have deliberately decided to go out and get their athletes that they do not do this at the price of straining intercollegiate relationships. Boys who are headed for one institution should not be bought off by another; let us be fair and above-board in all of this. It is too bad when an ardent big university fan tells a boy of unusual athletic prowess, whose brother is now at a New England college where the younger lad had planned to go, that if he will change his plans all of his expenses will be met by the fan's alma mater and a monthly check come to him for secretarial work, although now he operates a typewriter with only one finger! When a lad in a college town, who as a high school player has played on the college gridiron and has made all his plans to live at home and go to that college, is lured by financial offers from a sister institution, hard feelings develop. A reasonable degree of confidence in one another is essential. The finest thing about the relations between the "Little Three" in New England is the fact that there are no rules or regulations, and that all matters pertaining to athletics are left to the good judgment and high standards of each institution to determine for itself.

Athletic standards and practices change as the years go on. The day was when a boy who played football bought his own



uniform, paid his own railroad fare, joined with his mates in hiring the coach, if they had any. Now we have million dollar plants, twenty thousand dollar a season coaches, and expenditures for athletics that are staggering to the imagination. As these changes come, it is quite possible that some modification of the word "amateur" is necessary, particularly for those institutions which feel it desirable to offer attractions to athletes in admission and in aid.

These ideas are not new; many of them are contained in an interesting article in the November issue of the *Journal of Higher Education*, written by one of your own members, Professor Oberteuffer of Ohio State University, which I chanced to read a day or two ago, after I had written out this talk. On a redefinition of college amateurism, he says: "It simply implies that the traditional, aristocracy-based idea of amateurism, which came directly from the English, is incompatible with American life today". He agrees that we have overdone rules and regulations when he says: "We need a moratorium on such rules and programs. Perhaps we should suspend all rules and start over. Let us find out what college games are for, really." He likes conferences based on mutual trust and confidence, rather than regulations. I quote: "When colleges join together to form these conferences, they reap a splendid harvest; but how unfortunate it is that in some instances conferences have excused member colleges from exercising self-direction and self-respect in the administration of their athletics. The conference becomes little more than a smoke screen of protection for all sorts of practices designed to get the better of the other fellow." You may also be interested in his conclusion: "The handwriting has appeared already on the stadium walls. Consider the dozens of smaller colleges such as Rochester, Wesleyan, or Amherst. Possibly Amherst has the solution. A few years ago it was reported that they told their athletic competitors that they enjoyed playing with them, but that Amherst has only a few simple eligibility rules. If the competitors did not choose to compete under those circumstances, then there was nothing Amherst could do about it. Those simple rules, all under the jurisdiction of the college itself were: First, an athlete must be physically in good condition to play; second, he must be in good standing as a student at Amherst; and, third, he must have been a student there for the one year of orientation. Three simple rules. Are they impractical of administration in the Southern, or the Western, or the Pacific Coast, or the Ohio, or any other conference? Possibly they are. Perhaps we are not warranted yet in placing more confidence than suspicion on the other fellow."

Let's let football alone, and let's let each institution work out its own standards of eligibility frankly, openly, without any censoriousness on the part of the rest of us. Mr. Tunis's article a

couple of months ago certainly set tongues wagging. My main disagreement with him is the implication that an "A" institution is better than a "C" one. If you want to classify American institutions on the basis of athletic standards, let's call our Notre Dames, our Fordhams, and our Pittsburghs the "AA" institutions. Way down at the end of the list let's put the little fellows that have no Rose Bowl aspirations, that appoint coaches on faculty status with salaries usually less than professors, and instead of making profit from their athletic contests have to subsidize the program from the college budget, make no effort to lure potential athletes to come, and give no special aid to boys because they are athletes. Football players in these "Z" colleges make no All American teams; we don't figure very much in the headlines and the sports pages; the boys seem to like our rather simple athletic program, and usually all of our friends, except a few very rabid ones, are content with what we are trying to do. Between these simple institutions with their modest athletic programs and the "A" institutions at the top of the list you can classify all the rest of the colleges in the country, using, if you wish, every letter in the alphabet.



#### IV. PRESIDENT THURSTON J. DAVIES, COLORADO COLLEGE

My pleasure at being invited to speak here this morning before this group, with so many of whom I have had the pleasure of close association, was somewhat tempered by a thing I read in a sports column of a Philadelphia newspaper the day I arrived. Changing only the order of statement, I shall read it verbatim:

"Two men who never get anywhere: one, the fellow who wants the income tax abolished; second, a college president who rails about commercialism in football."

The worst of it is, I am not at all convinced that there is not more truth than poetry in his assertion. It would be hard for anyone, let alone a college administrator, to say anything new on the subject of intercollegiate sport. About all one can do, it seems to me, is perhaps to think out loud for a little while with an audience which he knows is living close to, and is vitally interested in, the problems about which he speaks.

None of us would deny, probably, that most of our thinking about football has a few initial difficulties which arise from a failure to be able to define some of the terms we so glibly use. Some of you will no doubt remember a meeting of college administrators three or four years ago at which almost the whole session was spent in trying to work out a definition for an athletic scholarship upon which a substantial majority could agree. Just where, for example, does the dividing line come between a scholarship given outright for athletic ability and a scholarship given to a young man who possesses the qualities required for consideration by a college or university scholarship committee, even though, perish the thought, he may have some promise of usefulness in the future to the college team. Again, just what do we mean by proselyting? We would all grant, of course, that for a university to send out, directly or indirectly, an ambassador, athletic scout, or what you will, to influence by direct promises of substantial financial reward young men of good athletic ability to come to a university, is proselyting. On the other hand, what about the alumnus who, knowing a young man to be the type he would like to see at his own college, urges him to go? Is there any college administrator who can say, "I am thankful that my institution is not like some other institutions, scrambling for athletic material," when he knows perfectly well that he wants his alumni interested in the problem of splendid material of all types for his institution? Or, again, just what is a paid athlete? We would all admit that a young man who is given tuition, board, room, and twenty dollars spending money a month, with a direct agreement that he is to give his services to the athletic teams of an institution, is a paid athlete. On the

other hand, every fraternity on every campus in the United States has board and room jobs, a fair proportion of which go to men of athletic ability. Interestingly enough, these jobs are almost without exception awarded by the undergraduate organizations themselves, and I wonder how many of us would go so far as to say to the social organizations on our campuses, "We are going to choose for you the men who are to have the board and room jobs at your houses, and we are going to see to it that none of them have the slightest possibility of being of the athletic type."

And to come back to proselyting for just a moment, must we not, if we are honest, admit that proselyting in colleges goes far beyond the urging of athletes to come to college? Some people find it hard to believe, but it is absolutely true that colleges definitely try to bring good intellectual material to their campuses. I wonder how many of the critics of football would make the same criticism about proselyting in the case of an alumnus who offers inducements to the top ranking scholar in the high school class to attend his own college. Let me say at once that I believe the college which failed to compete and compete vigorously on its academic merits for the best intellectual material coming out of the secondary schools would find itself very shortly in the academic discard. I point out merely that when alumni, faculties, undergraduates, and friends think in terms of undergraduate material which will bring to the college certain things in which they themselves are interested, athletics, dramatics, music, or scholarship, those young men are going to be urged to come to college, proselyted, if you wish.

I have touched upon only a few of the terms we use in discussing the football situation at the present time. There is just as much confusion and distortion of the so-called facts which so many people try to give us about college athletics. It is perfectly true, of course, that probably not more than ten percent of our college undergraduates play football. It is also perfectly true that 90 percent of our undergraduates are definitely interested in the game. We cannot, therefore, measure football's importance in terms of the proportion of undergraduates who actually play it. As for the question of paying our football players, is it not largely an academic question for the overwhelming majority of institutions? We hear so many glib statements about the profits from athletics. In the first place, most institutions are not making any profit out of athletics? They are struggling along with a minimum of expense, trying to give the men who compete for the college good instruction, good equipment, reasonable schedules, and adequate medical attention—speaking from the material standpoint. Some of the people who talk most about the profits in football should look over the financial statements of college athletic associations before being so sure that college athletics



can be placed on a professional basis.

And suppose, in the case of a certain group of teams, a conference, or a league, the suggestion is carried out of specific payment for participation in athletics. Is anyone so gullible as to believe for a moment that inducements would not be offered beyond those from authorized sources? The best high school football prospect in the conference area would no doubt have the legitimate and above-board offer made to him by several institutions in the conference. How many of us have such sublime faith in human nature as not to be perfectly sure that in some cases at least additional compensation will be offered *sub rosa* to get the man?

And then we hear a great deal about highly-paid coaches. It is perfectly true, of course, that some coaches receive high salaries, but I should like to have anybody in this room name me five fortunes made by coaches from the coaching profession. I wonder, furthermore, how many coaches in this room would recommend the profession to their sons from the standpoint of substantial monetary reward.

And when we say, with complete authority, that our young men are being exploited on the athletic field, and that the college is using them as attractions to produce large sums of money for various purposes, I should like to ask how many college teams would draw large crowds today if they were playing as independent organizations. It may be well to remember that professional football, and I am not speaking of it now in terms of any effect it may have on college football, received no attention and little support until it could use the background of star college careers to build up public attention for its teams.

With all of these confusions in our thinking, it is inevitable that the player himself has become almost the "forgotten man" of football. It seems to me that all of our thinking about the game should center around what it does for the men who play it. Approached from this angle, one's thinking takes on quite a different aspect. I wonder if all of our discussion hasn't tended to change the emphasis in football on the part of too many youngsters away from the game and to the reward. Any coach will say that the first and most valuable equipment a football player must have is a burning desire to play the game. Any coach will probably say also that, as far as his teams are concerned, the deepest and most lasting moments of exaltation come from a flaming loyalty for coach, team-mates, and college. I for one am old-fashioned enough to want to see football disappear as a college game so soon as the emphasis is on something else than these qualities. I still believe that they can be maintained. I still believe they are being maintained much more vigorously than some of the critics of the game will ever know.

Why should we let the fine qualities, the deep emotions, the

willingness to give, the desire to represent the college worthily, the thrill of a great feat, become secondary in the athlete's mind, simply because a few cynics are trying to tell us and tell them that these things are unworthy of men of maturity? Can not every one of us recapture for ourselves, even now, some of the thrill that comes to every athlete when he wears the colors of his college? Sophomoric? Yes, perhaps, but we need *more* of that kind of flaming loyalty—not less.

If there is anything that makes me angry, it is the calm assumption that the average college football player is a so-called "hired man." I think that it is too bad that we have let football get into a situation where an outstanding player can be, without any evidence whatever, considered a man who gives his best for pay and not for glory. To illustrate the injustice of this, a friend of mine was sitting in a New York club at luncheon on the Monday after two well-known teams had played a close and exciting game. One of the teams had a new coach. Next to the table where my friend was sitting were seated three men whose conversation went something like this:

"That was a great game Saturday, wasn't it?"

"Yes, 'X' is going to have some great teams within the next few years. He brought a lot of players with him from 'Y' College where he coached before."

"I don't believe that is so; he couldn't possibly get away with it."

"Oh, yes, he can. I heard from a prominent official right at the college that the effect is already beginning to show. Did you notice the big left tackle on his team? I was told definitely that he was brought to the college along with the coach."

My friend could be permitted a chuckle at this point, for he happened to know that the boy referred to by name was a senior in college playing his third season on the team, but his first as a regular, and was actually a son of a trustee and alumnus of the college.

I quote this as being typical of the injustice done fine young men by the unthinking person who believes that all or nearly all football in colleges is bought and paid for.

I said in the beginning that I have no panacea to offer. Perhaps the sports writer is correct. I should like, however, to offer some observations which may be pertinent, and, if you will permit, some challenges which present themselves quite clearly to me in my own attitude toward football.

In the first place, it does not seem to me that institutions are ever going to get very far in this matter by any regulation from the outside. The institution itself must, in the final analysis, be the one to develop its philosophy of athletics. Each college has, of course, its own problems, and those problems must be faced. We as college administrators cannot dodge the issue or the obli-



gation. Our institutions are going to have just about the athletic policy for which we as administrators stand. All of us know that if the athletic policy of an institution is unsound, the unsoundness comes back to the door of either deliberate or unintentional ignorance, and, in too many cases, lack of interest on the part of the administration. College faculties are going to have to admit that some of the things which we have been inclined to think of as outside the academic life of the college, and therefore unimportant, are, as colleges are constituted in this country, integral and important parts of our college program. We are beginning more and more to realize the obligation of the college to interest itself in all phases of undergraduate life, and we know that the best academic work is likely to be done in an atmosphere in which every hour of every day of the undergraduate's college career is of interest to the faculty and administration of the college.

And when I say an interest on the part of administrations and faculties, I don't mean the type of interest that expresses itself in the appointment of a faculty committee to take the responsibility, and the implied right, after that is done, for the rest of us to say, "We are now relieved of all responsibility. We have done our duty in regard to athletics, and we can now sit back and criticize to our hearts' content." We must, it seems to me, be keenly alert in our administrations and faculties to the problems which athletics have brought to our campuses, and we must, further than that, try to work out athletic policies with the help rather than the indifference of our faculties, for, to some extent at least, the athletic policy is going to affect the esteem or lack of esteem in which the college is held.

In the second place, I find it difficult to admit the good sportsmanship, which we all place as a cornerstone in rearing the structure of justification for college athletics, when I see in the administration of athletics, both as within and as between institutions, so much suspicion, accusation, self-righteousness, and disposition to feel that advantage is being taken by other institutions. It is disheartening to see the amount of this sort of thing that goes on, particularly disheartening because gradually this attitude cannot fail to reflect itself in the minds of our players. I heard a faculty representative in an open athletic meeting about a year ago make the statement that he would like to think Coach "X" had been sincere when he said he did not want paid players on his team, but that he couldn't be, after seeing the type of team the coach had last year. As it happened, this man knew nothing about the situation in the college he accused, he was almost three thousand miles away from it, and brought up not one single fact to prove his allegation. If football is to receive this treatment from its so-called friends, we can hardly expect the general public to have a sane and sound view about it.

And so my second plea is for our own good sportsmanship. Do not misunderstand. I am not saying for a minute that the game of football, or colleges playing it, are free from guilt in its management and in its administration. I am saying that our own suspicions, unfounded in many cases, are beclouding a number of main issues. We are not under obligations to play other institutions unless we want to. While I am not necessarily pleading here for institutions to make public all of their athletic actions, I am saying that the frank approach of one sportsman to another in the matter of athletic rumors would do more to eliminate our own feeling of self-righteousness and our suspicion of the motives of others than any other single thing I can think of. We shall never get Utopia in this regard, but we may get back the feeling that the word sportsmanship still has a place in sports.

In the third place, it seems to me that in some sports in some institutions we are building up a background of the type of fine tradition which deserves to be perpetuated by endowment. Here, again, we come back to the question of real institutional interest in athletics. I should like to see the time come when the work of an outstanding coach, who has given much in inspiration for fine living to generations of young college men, will be memorialized by an endowed position carrying his name. To those who would suggest that, in doing this, I am taking away from the endowment for strictly academic purposes, I reply that many alumni and friends of institutions, particularly the younger ones for whom the inspiration of a great coach is still vivid, might develop an interest in the institution along all lines if they realized its desire to protect and to dignify a part of college life which has had an important effect on the development in them of the things for which they believe the college stands. There will, of course, be no rush to do this—and it is, of course, not a new idea—but the institution which obtains such endowment is going to attract to itself the type of athlete who wants to play for the thrill of the game and the glory of his college, and who will be willing to make every effort, to do any work, to make it possible for him to have a part in it.

And finally, my experience has been that the finest type of young athlete thrills to the challenge of the education which he earns. I ask you to go over in your own mind some of the men you have coached, some of the men you have followed through college, men who represent all that is best in the college athlete, and ask them whether or not the struggle was worth while. Their answers may well point the way to our thinking.

Each one of our players is an individual. We have been too inclined to let his personal problems be shunted over to individuals interested too largely in his athletic ability, and too little inclined to work out those problems with him on the same basis



as we do with other undergraduates who are having a hard time to get through financially. The college has the obligation to *know the source* from which the athlete is getting the funds for his college education. If a boy is approaching the problem of college with the desire to shop around for the best offer, he is selling the very qualities which make him an athlete. As soon as he approaches college with the "get" rather than the "give" idea, he is not the boy the best college wants. Most colleges have done a splendid piece of work in enabling young men to earn their way, and will continue to do so for athletes and for non-athletes, and the young man who works for his education is going to respect both himself and his college the more for the privilege of getting from it all that is fine and giving to it all that he has.

No college is free from athletic problems, but I have no doubt in my mind that football will continue to be the great game it is as long as we have a substantial number of colleges, and I believe an increasing number of colleges, that are realizing the necessity for working out a continuing and permanent policy of sound attitude toward athletic problems within the institution, whose representatives still keep the term sportsmanship uppermost both within the institution and in its relations with other institutions, of colleges which think in terms of a dignified athletic program, and of colleges which look upon the individual athlete as a fine young American for whom participation in the game is still a privilege which will bring him lasting rewards. It is this on which football was founded. It must not be changed, even though the "easy way" may seem to be a giving in either to public clamor for, or to the lure of, a professionalized game. It is for each college to give the answer for itself.

## APPENDIX I

### ROUND TABLE CONFERENCES

#### 1. ON THE ELIGIBILITY OF JUNIOR COLLEGE GRADUATES

A round table conference on "The Eligibility of Junior College Graduates" was held by the National Collegiate Athletic Association on Monday afternoon, December 28, 1936, at two-fifteen o'clock, at the Hotel Pennsylvania, New York City, Dean R. L. Sackett, Pennsylvania State College, presiding.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: Let me read a brief preliminary statement that will bring us up to the same starting line, so that certain things may be in your minds as background for this discussion by those who represent territory in which the junior college transfer student is a problem.

We are discussing the best method of contributing to the welfare of the junior college student who participates in intercollegiate athletics while in the junior college and then transfers to a senior college. As the discussion goes on you will realize that the conditions vary considerably so far as the college itself is concerned and also the treatment of the junior college transfer. This is an attempt to bring about some unity or general acceptance of a procedure which will be common in the different conferences and which will be acceptable to them when students appear as contestants in National Collegiate Athletic Association meets.

It is a very complicated and difficult problem, as you will realize as we go along. I have here the preliminary statement of a report to the N. C. A. A. on this subject which I will read for whatever information it may give to some of you. Most of you are so familiar with it that there is nothing which I can say that would help to clarify it.

(Chairman Sackett read the Report of the Committee on Eligibility, printed in the Proceedings.)

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: Professor Willett, will you tell us what you have found?

PROFESSOR H. C. WILLETT (University of Southern California): Mr. Chairman, I hope you will understand that what I present is not intended to be a picture of the situation the country over, but rather a picture of the situation on the Pacific Coast.

Recent government reports show that considerably more than one-third of all junior college students in the United States are enrolled in junior colleges on the Pacific Coast. In that same area, there are located roughly five per cent of the four-year colleges of the country. Consequently, the colleges of the Pacific Coast are perhaps more keenly sensitive to junior college transfer problems than are the colleges in other sections where relatively fewer transfers are received by each institution.

The Pacific Coast Conference and the junior colleges have, in a sense, grown up together. During the past twenty years the Conference has tried various methods of dealing with athletic transfers from junior colleges, none of which, except the method now followed, proved entirely satisfactory to both the junior colleges and the four-year institutions. Other conferences on the Pacific Coast have also dealt with the problem, but it is safe to say that the experiences and conclusions of the Pacific



Coast Conference are typical of the experiences and conclusions of the other collegiate associations in the district.

It is perhaps not necessary here to define a typical junior college. For the present discussion, however, in so far as it applies to the Pacific Coast, we have in mind a two-year institution offering not only the first two years of general college work, but also post high school training in vocations and practical citizenship.

We have in mind, primarily, a tax-supported institution designed especially to meet community needs, an institution which in most of its aspects is merely a two-year extension of the local secondary school system. In fact, in California, where more than 30,000 junior college students are enrolled, the junior college is officially a part of the State's secondary school system.

In passing, it might be remarked that 90 per cent of these 30,000 students are enrolled in public junior colleges.

Variations from the typical junior college take on several different forms. First, there are the private junior colleges, more numerous in the East than in the West. In our district, these private schools differ from the public junior colleges in that they are either privately endowed, or charge high tuition rates, and emphasize preparation for the universities. The number of students enrolled in such private schools is relatively small.

A second variation is a four-year type of school embracing the 11th, 12th, 13th, and 14th grades. Inasmuch as junior colleges of this type may draw their athletic teams from all four of these grades, special athletic problems arise, the introduction of which in the present discussion would only complicate further an already complex problem.

A third variation is the junior college connected with or perhaps an integral part of a four-year college. We have a number of such junior colleges on the Pacific Coast, and they contribute also their own peculiar athletic problems. With your permission, however, we shall postpone to some other occasion the discussion of these problems and other problems relating to junior colleges which are variations from the standard type.

We return then to the typical junior colleges. These are frequently small institutions, sometimes overshadowed in importance by the local high schools. The athletic competition offered by such junior colleges is hardly up to that offered by our average large high schools, and is in no way to be compared with freshman competition in even our small four-year colleges. I think that this point is important, for we should not measure all junior college competition by the standards set by the few large junior colleges.

These large junior colleges, of course, present a much higher level of athletic competition, and make necessary such discussions as we are engaged in here today. And yet these larger junior colleges confine themselves almost exclusively to competition with one another, with occasional contests against college freshman teams. I cannot recall an instance in recent years in which a junior college team in our district has competed in a major sport against a four-year college team. There are at least two reasons for this. In the first place, the best junior college teams are no match for the average college varsity. In the second place, the colleges themselves for the most part have written or unwritten rules or policies against such competition, prompted, I suppose, by the fear of public disapproval of the matching of men against boys, and possibly by the fear that the occasional upsetting of a college team by a junior college team would be, to say the least, annoying.

To put it briefly, on the Pacific Coast college and junior college athletics travel different roads.

As was stated above, the Pacific Coast Conference has tried various ways of dealing with the junior college athletic transfer. May I interpolate here that I have had personal experience with these variations over

a period of twenty years, so I speak with some direct knowledge as to what the situation has been.

The application of the college transfer rule was most violently protested by the junior colleges themselves. It was claimed, and rightly so, that the high school graduate with athletic ambitions was tempted to leave his home community for college, thus depriving the local junior college not only of his athletic ability, but also of his enrollment, which would bring to the junior college its proportionate share of financial aid from the state.

Perhaps it should here be explained that the college transfer rule in the Pacific Coast Conference, and generally throughout the district, differs from the transfer rule in some other parts of the country in that the transfer is not only required to remain out of all competition for one full year, but is also deprived of one year of competition by reason of his transfer. It is therefore almost unnecessary to say that the application of our transfer rule would divert from the junior colleges almost all of the athletes qualified for college admission, for if a boy competed, let us say, in football during his second junior college year, he would have left in a Conference college only year of competition, and that in his senior year.

Our Conference tried holding the junior college transfer out of competition for a year without depriving him of a year of competition, which is, I understand, the plan proposed by our Executive Committee. But in doing this we ran counter to the desires and policies of the academic and administrative authorities of both colleges and junior colleges. The plan constituted an open invitation to the transferring athlete to prolong his college course for the sake of athletic competition. It was hard for our college and university authorities, already embarrassed by the overcrowding of the lower college classes, to square this transfer rule with their policy of encouraging high school graduates to take advantage of the college courses offered by their local junior colleges, with the assurance that if that work was well done they might proceed to their college degrees without loss of time.

I shall not burden you with elaborations of other problems we were forced to deal with. A brief recital of a few of them must suffice.

There was the problem of the high school graduate who found himself lacking in some college entrance requirement and who was prevented by local school rules (as in Los Angeles) from returning to high school for post high school work, and was thus practically forced either into the local junior college or into some expensive private school. It seemed unfair to penalize such a student who entered the junior college to remove his college entrance deficiencies, but not to penalize the boy with like deficiencies who because of better financial circumstances was able to enter a private preparatory school and perhaps there enjoy a better quality of athletic competition than that offered by the junior college.

There was also the problem of the boy who looked forward to certain professional courses in college (for example, certain branches of engineering, pharmacy, and dentistry) and who found that he could not use to advantage more than one year of junior college work. Such a boy, whether he competed in his junior college year or not, would have been allowed under our transfer rule to compete in only his junior and senior years.

We found that pre-college recruiting and subsidizing of athletes in private preparatory schools was intensified or threatened to become more acute under the plan which required the junior college transfer to submit to a transfer rule. The reason for this, I think, is fairly obvious.

There were other problems, but let this recital suffice for the present.

What then was the solution found for these problems and nearly all others connected with the transfer of junior college athletes? For we did find a solution, and for the past eight years the colleges and junior



colleges have lived happily and peacefully under our present junior college rule. The formula adopted by our Conference eight years ago was in effect as follows. Let us pretend that when a student enters a junior college, for any purpose whatsoever, he actually enters a Conference institution. If at any later date we have to deal with that student as an athlete in one of our colleges, let us pretend he was our own student while he was in junior college and determine his athletic status by applying to his case, so far as may be possible, all of the rules and regulations of our Conference.

This formula for dealing with the junior college transfer reaches further than one might suppose. It means, for example, that the transferred student must present a junior college record that meets certain Conference academic and scholastic requirements which, I may say parenthetically, would not be held against a student who transferred from a standard college.

I shall not take time to illustrate this point. The formula also makes it comparatively easy to determine the amount of competition remaining in each sport for the junior college transfer. If, for example, a boy comes from a junior college and presents a rather complicated athletic history, as sometimes happens, it is a comparatively simple task for us to determine his status by pretending that his entire junior college experience was in our own institution. Thus, if he first entered the four-year college, then went to a junior college, and then came to our own institution, his transfer from the first college into the junior college deprives him of one year of varsity competition. Every season of competition in junior college is counted a season of varsity competition, and he may come to us as a junior without any more competition allowed in his sport. Or, a boy may enter a junior college and during his first year there make up certain entrance requirements for the college of his choice. Let us say that during that first year he does not compete. If he remains in the junior college for the next two years and competes in a sport upon entering a Conference college, he will be allowed only one year of competition in that sport. The variations are almost endless, but all of them lend themselves to the solution provided by our formula.

I have been commissioned by the Pacific Coast Conference respectfully to urge that the proposed legislation regarding junior college transfers in N. C. A. A. competition be not approved. To adopt the proposed rule would be for us on the Pacific Coast a step backward. It would be equivalent to reinstating a rule long ago abandoned as undesirable and to renouncing our present policy, which has stood the test of eight years and which we are convinced is fair to colleges and junior colleges alike. We ask you to bear in mind that while it is true that junior college competition is not high school competition, it is equally true that it is not college competition, at least in our district.

We request the continuation of the policy adopted by this Association two years ago permitting colleges which are members of Conferences which in turn are members of the N. C. A. A. to certify their athletes under their own Conference rules. We realize that the rules of one Conference may differ from the rules of another, but we do not believe that such differences necessarily mean inequalities.

This finishes my formal report, and I should like, while I am on my feet, just to add one point which I think is not very clear in some sections of the country, particularly the Middle West. Suppose that a boy has been in junior college for two years, and, for simplicity, let us suppose he has competed on the junior college team for those two years. If he enters a Pacific Coast Conference school, being otherwise eligible, he may compete immediately this year in his sport, and next year, but he may not compete the year following. If that same boy should come to a Big Ten institution, the situation is this. He would not compete this year, but he would be allowed to compete next year and the year after.

The difference lies simply in where those two years are placed. We place the two years immediately after his junior college transfer; the Big Ten conference places it a year later.

The boy gets the same amount of competition, but with us we have found that the opposition of our academic and administrative authorities, in enticing that boy to remain in college an extra year for the sake of athletic competition, met with disfavor from every angle, and we have become firmly convinced that we are much better off if we allow the boy to complete his full quota of college competition in the usual sequence of years instead of giving him the same amount of competition with the delay of one year.

I don't think that there is any unfairness or inequality between the Pacific Coast and the Middle West in that respect. Our boys may compete against your boys this year, but you will have some junior college conference transfers who will be competing against us two years from now when our own boys are ineligible.

I didn't care to put this in my written report, but while I was on my feet, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to make the comment for the sake of clarity.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: Thank you, Professor Willett, for this very clear statement of conditions on the Coast.

Professor King, of Kansas State, a representative on the Council of the Fifth District, will give us his information and his judgment concerning this matter.

PROFESSOR H. H. KING (Kansas State College): I have prepared no formal, written statement in regard to the conditions pertaining to this problem in my own district. When I was asked to make some comments in regard to this, Dean Sackett asked me if I wouldn't speak for the Middle West. That covers a much broader territory than the territory that Professor Willett mentioned.

The Middle West, athletically, begins with Ohio and ends with the western end of Nebraska and Kansas, and runs from Canada down to Texas, and consequently you are going to find a lot of difference of opinion as represented in the different athletic conferences and associations that are incorporated in this district.

I endeavored to get some information in regard to my own district, the Fifth District, which includes seven states, starting with the Dakotas and going down to Texas, and in that district we have many different types of conferences. We have the conferences of state institutions which, as a rule, have incorporated our largest educational institutions. Then we have numbers of conferences composed largely of the smaller denominational schools. The problems confronting these different conferences are oftentimes quite different, and the way in which they look at this junior college question is also quite different.

My own conference, the Big Six, does not permit immediate participation to junior college graduates, nor does the Big Ten.

We have another large conference in our region, the Missouri Valley Conference, which last year passed a ruling permitting junior college participation immediately upon enrollment in a member institution of that conference. However, there have been certain members of this conference that have not availed themselves of this opportunity at all, even though by rule they might do so.

I understand there were only three junior college students that actually participated in athletics the past year under that ruling in the Missouri Valley Conference.

The smaller conferences, without any exception, so far as I have been able to ascertain, permit junior college participation immediately upon enrollment. We have eleven such conferences in our district, and I



wrote to the presidents of each of those conferences and in no case did I receive word contrary to that statement.

So in my own district it comes down to the fact that the only conference of which I have any information that does not permit immediate participation is the Big Six Conference.

Then in the territory that is nominally covered by the Big Ten, which would be Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Illinois, and Iowa, there are also a large number of conferences composed of the smaller institutions, and I have been informed by representatives from the Big Ten Conference that the treatment of the junior college in these various small conferences is quite different in different localities.

I can see one reason why the junior college transfer, or graduate who moves to a senior college, should be allowed to participate in a small institution. These colleges are usually hard-pressed financially, as well as hard-pressed in getting athletes. Most of them—that is, most of these conferences,—play all of their men four years rather than three years, as is the case in the larger conferences, so they naturally wouldn't look on this problem in the same light in which a larger conference would view it.

Our own conference, the Big Six Conference, has discussed this question many times. We have had delegates from junior colleges meeting with us in almost every convention that we have had, stating the advantages which would accrue to our conference from changing our rule and allowing immediate participation on the part of the junior college athlete, but we as yet have not seen fit to change that rule in any sense whatsoever, and some of the reasons that have been advocated by members of this conference, while they may not be new reasons to any of you, have, however, served as adequate reasons for us to refuse to change our rule.

In the first place, the quality of the graduates of the junior colleges in our region varies very greatly. We have some schools that are established as junior colleges in which we do not consider the set-up,—the faculty, for example,—as being of that quality that would give the student in the first two years of college work preparation equal to that which he gets in the larger institutions. Some of them are, as has already been stated, almost glorified high schools.

I myself teach a number of these junior college boys when they come to our institution. I get them their first year, and I find—and this is in a technical subject, chemistry, to be more exact—that the students lack the preparation that our own students have. Then I feel that if we should add to the burden that they are carrying in trying to keep up with these better trained students athletic participation, it would be almost hopeless for a number of them. That wouldn't be true for all of them. There are certain junior colleges in which the equipment of the student is on a parity with that in our own institutions.

Take, for example, the Kansas City Junior College; the training there is very adequate. They, however, have no extra-curricular activities whatsoever; they don't even have any athletic teams,—no literary societies, or anything of that sort. They have specialized on the scholastic requirements and the results are quite evident, on the whole.

Another objection that our conference offers is that there is no real need of permitting four years' competition to a junior college graduate and only three years' competition to our own students. That objection has been put forth quite frequently in our own conference. Our own students do not like the differentiation.

At Tulsa University they have five junior college students that seem, so their faculty man told me, to be a group who will represent the University as their basketball team for this fall. They just enrolled this fall, and are apparently going to make up the basketball team for the coming season.

Well, now, I wouldn't argue whether that was right or wrong, but I will

state that the other athletes at Tulsa University don't like it, and my informant says they expect to have a little difficulty trying to iron out that situation at Tulsa University.

Professor Willett mentioned the fact that a number of graduates of junior colleges require three years to finish the work when they get to the senior institution, and that is true. Most of our junior college students enroll in technical subjects requiring three years to complete their work. We feel that in the case of that student there is no hardship at all worked upon him. He has his one year in which he completes the residence requirements, becomes accustomed to the big college atmosphere, and yet has his two years of participation left him.

We feel that the best single rule that we have in our conference is the one-year residence rule. We feel that it takes quite a lot out of a student in becoming accustomed to the atmosphere in a larger institution. You all know the arguments for the non-participation of the freshman who is going away from home for the first time, and must become accustomed to being on his own more or less, in new surroundings, under new conditions, and we feel that no freshman should be allowed to participate, and out in our region we think that is the finest single rule that we have.

These junior colleges are composed of students who are still living at home. They have not broken the home ties in the sense which they would when they move out of the community away from their home and into new conditions, and while they may have had two years' academic training, as a matter of fact they haven't yet met one of the greatest difficulties they can meet when they go to college, and that is adjusting themselves to conditions away from home. We think that is a very valid reason why they should not be allowed to participate.

And then another point which may be of minor consequence, but I think it has a bearing on this—at least, we out in that region think so—and that is that it would encourage recruiting and subsidizing of junior college athletes. We think that it would. I know of two instances where representatives of large junior colleges in our region have approached me and asked, "What in the world is the matter with you? Why don't you wake up to what this will mean to your institution? We will have our coaches come to your summer coaching schools. We will teach our boys your systems in basketball and in football. Then they can come up to your institution and enroll and start immediate participation."

In other words, they indicated their willingness to serve as a training school; just as the major leagues have their smaller leagues to do the training, the junior colleges would be willing to join up with senior colleges and train their athletes for entrance into the larger school. That may be overemphasized. I know of those two instances where it has been mentioned. Rumors are afloat to the effect that those things exist elsewhere, and I believe that permitting immediate participation would encourage that over and above what is going on at the present time.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: I have a letter from Professor Franklin, of the University of Colorado, which does not present much in the way of new light, but it does reflect the conditions and their action in the Rocky Mountain territory adjacent.

(Chairman Sackett read the letter from Professor Franklin.)

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: Then Professor McDiarmid, of Texas Christian University, at Fort Worth, wrote quite an extended letter.

(Chairman Sackett read the letter from Professor McDiarmid.)

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: Those are the principal letters which I have received from various territories, in addition to the statements which you have heard.

Professor King mentioned the Missouri Valley and the Big Six. That



situation just illustrates the aggravations of the situation. There are two conferences in immediate territory, and their differences went so far that the Big Six would not play, or took action that it would not play, those of the Missouri Valley Conference which admitted the transfer to immediate participation, which no doubt was the reason why so few of the Missouri Valley Conference institutions did permit the transfer from the junior college to continue his participation.

It is important that we show extraordinary wisdom in ironing this thing out and providing a basis which can be acceptable, if there is any such solution. The subject is open to you for presentation of views and of constructive suggestion.

PROFESSOR E. L. LARSON (University of Arizona, Border Conference): I want to ask a question or two of Professor Willett. What do you do there in the Coast Conference with regard to those students that have diploma credit and certificate credit; or do you make any distinction there?

PROFESSOR WILLETT: Athletically, we make no distinction; academically, diploma credit is given no college credit whatsoever. For example, we have transferring back to the Coast, as an exact case repeatedly met, students who have graduated from high school on the Pacific Coast and not been eligible to enter any California University, who have attended a junior college for two years and completed two years' of junior college work and secured a diploma of graduation, have gone to Eastern colleges and been admitted as juniors, but in their home state weren't yet ready for freshman admission. In other words, we have that double program, the academic, that is real college work, and admission to colleges of high standards.

Of accomplishment in the certificate work, we have the majority of junior college students in non-certificate, or non-college courses. Now if the latter, by any chance, get into college, so far as athletics are concerned any competition in junior college is treated just as if they were college students, but academically they might even be beginning freshmen. It is possible, and has happened, for a student from the junior college to enter California University as a freshman and not have left to his credit any college competition at all, having used it all up in junior college.

PROFESSOR LARSON: Suppose he did enter as a freshman, and had had two years of competition in junior college, then after he had spent another year of time in your school, he would be permitted that third year of varsity competition?

PROFESSOR WILLETT: Yes, he would be permitted a third year; in fact, if he had other requirements met he could do it the first year in college.

PROFESSOR LARSON: He could do that even without twenty-four hours of degree credit?

PROFESSOR WILLETT: No, he must have his twenty-four hours of degree credit.

PROFESSOR LARSON: So that he couldn't just come in there and—

PROFESSOR WILLETT: He couldn't come in and be classified as a freshman and compete on the varsity team. If he had his twenty-four hours of degree credit he would be classified as a sophomore and could compete.

PROFESSOR LARSON: We had that question come up from your conference, Professor Willett, and our conference, too, took the stand that they would accept these students from junior colleges for competition,

even though their credit wasn't acceptable as carrying twenty-four semester hours credit.

PROFESSOR WILLETT: They must have degree credit before they can compete in the California school.

PROFESSOR LARSON: I would like to suggest that probably I am out of step with what has already been said. Our conference is a smaller conference; that is, we have a number of smaller schools and we get a number of junior college transfers from your territory and from Professor King's territory. We have students from Kansas and Missouri, and some from the Southern States, and here is the policy that we follow in our conference. One year after registration at a junior college, a student is charged with a season of freshman competition whether he has competed or not, and if he starts his competition in his second year of junior college, he starts with varsity competition. He is eligible to compete in our conference if he has twenty-four hours of credit; he is eligible to compete on varsity teams immediately on registration, and this has been the general viewpoint in our conference with legislation that has come up, that in junior college the junior college competition as a whole is a little less effective and a little less desirable than is your competition in four-year colleges, and consequently, if a person should compete his first year and his second year in junior college, he is properly charged with freshman competition and with a year of varsity competition so that he has two years of varsity competition left to him.

That has been our position, and I believe I speak for the conference when I say that I believe the attitude of the Border Conference will be that on the whole we are justified in admitting junior college transfers from either one year or two years of work in junior college to varsity competition without losing any competition that they have not actually had except in the case of that freshman year.

I should like to ask one other question while I am on my feet, and that is this. In your conference, Professor Willett, you have these people who may register as freshmen and you don't provide for freshman competition, do you?

PROFESSOR WILLETT: We have freshman competition, yes, freshman teams.

PROFESSOR LARSON: Well, suppose a person competed as a freshman and then he is a member of the squad and he isn't quite right for good varsity competition; you would keep him from the varsity squad for two years and then play him—I mean, without competition, as a member of the squad but not competing, and then he may have two or three years of competition left to him in his fourth and fifth year in college—isn't that correct?

PROFESSOR WILLETT: If he doesn't qualify for a degree, yes, his competition may be deferred.

PROFESSOR LARSON: Then the legislation that you have in regard to the junior college student really is discriminating against the junior college student in favor of your student who first registered in your four-year college?

PROFESSOR WILLETT: I don't see it.

PROFESSOR LARSON: Well, didn't I get this straight, that if a person comes to you from a junior college, having competed his freshman year and his sophomore year there, that he may immediately compete?

PROFESSOR WILLETT: He may, if he is eligible, compete.



PROFESSOR LARSON: The junior and senior year?

PROFESSOR WILLETT: Yes, he may.

PROFESSOR LARSON: But he may stay out a year and compete then that fourth and fifth year that he happens to have in college?

PROFESSOR WILLETT: That is right.

PROFESSOR LARSON: I would like to suggest that, speaking for the Border Conference, we believe that the junior college student shouldn't lose any competition that he hasn't actually had, although we do favor this general idea of checking the freshman competition for those that compete their first year in junior college; but if they don't compete their second year in junior college, that they have three years of varsity competition coming to them.

While there are some dangers, we believe that, as long as we have small four-year schools and junior colleges which are meeting local needs, the educational needs of those students are best cared for by having the type of legislation which we do have.

PROFESSOR WILLETT: Your policy is substantially ours.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: May I ask two questions of Professor Willett and Professor Larson? I judge, Professor Willett, that in determining eligibility to continue in a sport, if a student, for instance, played football two years in the junior college, he may only play two years; but suppose he stays three years in the junior college, he might compete those three years in track, for instance, making a total of five years or so of total participation, counting the junior college participation. Is that correct?

PROFESSOR WILLETT: Let's see if I get the picture.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: First, take football. He has played four years in football, junior and senior college combined, but he stays the fifth year, and he could participate in track for three years, say for instance, of his junior college, making a total participation of five years in that case in sports.

PROFESSOR WILLETT: So could our own students in college, whether in junior college or not.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: There is another situation that arises between different territories of the United States.

PROFESSOR WILLETT: We have a period during which all varsity competition must be accomplished. There is a limit on the number of years during which a student may compete.

PROFESSOR LARSON: Is that four years in your Conference, Professor Willett?

PROFESSOR WILLETT: The rule reads in rather a complicated way. It is four years, beginning with the date of the student's registration. That is, if he enters in February, the first year runs from February to February. But all the varsity competition in all sports whatsoever must be covered within the period of four years of registration.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: Do you mean the four years in senior college?

PROFESSOR WILLETT: Four years whether in senior college or not. You see, that allows one year for freshman competition, and I really think this whole problem is complicated by the debate as to the desirability or

undesirability of freshman teams. I think it is a debatable question. But after that, he must accomplish all varsity competition within a period of four academic years.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: Professor Willett, suppose a student transfers from a junior college at the end of one year, do you require him to stay in residence one year before participation in athletics?

PROFESSOR WILLETT: Not if he is eligible; he may start immediately and graduate on schedule.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: You see, there is another difference between different conferences.

MR. WILLIAMS (Texas Tech.): What about high school students who play on junior college teams?

PROFESSOR WILLETT: We don't have that situation, since our students get into junior college only after graduation from high school. But if he should get into junior college no matter for what purpose, to finish high school work or otherwise, athletically he is considered as a junior college student and is charged with competition.

PROFESSOR LARSON: Might I suggest this in answer to Mr. Williams' question? In our conference there was a ruling in one of our meetings, that if he is a high school student and plays on the junior college team, we disregard that high school competition. It is only when he is a junior college student that that junior college competition is to be counted.

PROFESSOR WILLETT: I think I get this picture, which in future years is going to complicate this situation more and more. Using Pasadena College as an example, a large junior college of several thousand students, it is of the type covering four years, the 11th, 12th, 13th, and 14th years. They have single teams from that junior college. In our conference we make this exception to our basic rule. If the boy is an 11th year student and competes, he is charged with high school; if he is a 12th year student, he is charged with high school; but after he has passed the 12th year any competition is charged as college competition.

DR. A. C. NELSON (University of Denver): I think I can amplify a bit the statements which were made in the letter from Professor Franklin concerning the Rocky Mountain Conference situation. In so doing, I want to put in my word in favor of the Pacific Coast Conference approach to this problem. The Rocky Mountain Conference have struggled with it for some three or four years, and the rule which was quoted a moment ago in substance, in Professor Franklin's letter, is a sort of compromise between the two extremes which have been presented here. That is, there was a group of individuals in our conference who felt that the one-year residence rule was quite necessary. They felt that on the premise which I think Dr. King suggested, that without such regulations the tendency to recruiting and subsidizing and proselyting and so forth would be very keen.

On the other hand, there was another group who felt convinced, as I am personally, that it was one of the difficulties in our intercollegiate athletic program, nowadays, that we so often divorce, more or less, our approach to intercollegiate athletic rules from our academic rules, and that it would be entirely unfair to a young man who had two years in junior college and then came to a senior college, and would be able in the senior college to finish normally in two more years academically, to say to him, "You cannot finish athletically in two or more years and still have the same amount of competition everybody else has," because that would put



the athletic attitude on one plane and the academic attitude on an entirely different one, which we felt is unsound.

The result of those two differences of opinion in our conference resulted in the rule which we now have, and that is that any student who completes his junior college course,—has a certificate of graduation from a junior college implying that he has academically completed that which he went to the junior college for—may go on into the senior college and continue uninterrupted competition in the senior college without further residence requirement and have his two years of additional varsity competition, assuming, of course, that he has competed, as most of them have if they are athletic transfers, in the junior college during the two-year period they were in the junior college.

On the contrary, we did make the exception, to satisfy the other group, that if the student did not finish the normal two-year graduation requirements of the junior college, and then transferred before that time to a senior college, he wasn't doing academically that which he started out to do, and therefore would perhaps be liable, reasonably, to some penalty athletically and would under those conditions be required to have a year of residence in the senior college before he was eligible to compete.

In other words, he would have to establish his eligibility and his academic standing in the senior college, but having established in the junior college his academic standing by virtue of having graduated from the junior college and reached a normal point of completion, then he might in the senior college go ahead with his uninterrupted athletic competition just as he went ahead uninterruptedly on his academic side.

So our present regulation is a sort of compromise between these two extremes. We are running into some difficulties and no doubt will continue to run into some. Some cases have arisen already where a student completes a full two years, and sometimes more than that, in a certain type of course for which he doesn't actually get a diploma, but he has gotten to a point where he has to stop the junior college; he can't go any further, and then transfers to the senior college. We have taken each of those cases and determined them through our eligibility committee on their actual merit academically, and then have tied in the athletic with that and made a decision in each case on the basis of the information which we get in the case.

So we have a combination between those two situations which we feel is rather workable. I personally am convinced that the ideal is to do the thing which the Pacific Coast Conference has done,—to check up the student's junior college program on the basis of what you would have required of him had he been in your institution—and if he has done in the junior college what you would have expected him to do in your institution, then he is no better off, no worse off, than the man who started with you.

It seems to me that is the only fair way to treat these cases. If you don't, you are unfairly penalizing the student who comes from the junior college to the senior college, and you are in effect saying to him, "Because you went to junior college, we are going to force you, if you are really interested in athletics, to take a five-year college course where you normally would complete it in four years," and I think that is academically unsound. You wouldn't do that in dramatics, or in any other activities the student might participate in. So it seems to me that if a student has met your academic requirements, then he should be eligible to go on uninterruptedly with respect to athletics.

Our competition rule, so far as total participation is concerned, reads something like this. The first post high school year does not count. We had to put in that rule because we had a number of cases of small four-year colleges where the freshmen played with the varsity and had four years of competition. We ran into all sorts of difficulty determining when a student had freshman and varsity competition. We met that by saying

that the first post high school year of football, or in any sport, does not count, but each succeeding year does count.

Now that, by the way, is an interesting rule from this angle, that there are some cases in junior college where students have spent three years in the junior college and have played all three of those years. Now the regulation which we have takes care of that situation, because his first post high school year, his first year in junior college, counts as freshman year and is taken out, then he has three years of varsity competition. If he has had two more years in junior college he only has one more year left in senior college. If he had one year, the first post high school year, and then two years in the junior college, then he has his two years just as if he had his freshman year as a freshman.

They come from a small four-year college in the same way. If a student goes to a small four-year college in Arizona, some place where they allow freshmen to compete with the varsity because of a limit in the student body, then that student plays his first year down there and we charge that as the equivalent of freshman competition in our own institution. If he comes as a sophomore, then he goes on. If he comes from a four-year college he is automatically a migrant and must have his year's residence.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: The man who comes from the small sectarian college as compared with the man who comes from the junior college—no one has spoken concerning that aspect of the problem, but I imagine if someone were to speak for the East that question would be a matter of considerable concern.

DR. NELSON: You mean in terms of residence. That is true, because you don't have a comparable situation between a four-year college where a student can normally continue in the institution for four full years as his normal, academic program, and if he transfers from that to another four-year institution, he is in effect a migrant, whereas if he goes to a junior college for two years, when he has finished his two years he can't go on in that and then transfer.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: But you are speaking as if the junior college were designed only for students who were going to transfer to college. As a matter of fact, less than one-third of them do, according to a statement in the *Educational Record*, so it is not to be assumed that they have no terminal purposes other than to prepare a man for the additional two years in college.

DR. NELSON: But your junior college is designed on the basis of its normal terminus at the end of two years; the other college is four years.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: Does anyone care to speak for the Big Ten Conference, or for the New England territory?

DR. ROCKWELL (M.I.T.): May I ask, just as a matter of information, after they have completed their first two years, do they continue in that senior college or do they carry on athletics at all, or do they quit their interest in athletics as soon as they have had that first two years of competition? I am wondering how much of it is athletic interest that brings them to the big college and how much of it is educational.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: Professor Willett, can you answer that?

PROFESSOR WILLETT: I am sorry, I don't fully appreciate the question.

DR. ROCKWELL: My point is simply this. If a boy transfers from the junior college and then has his two years in the senior college, does he



continue and graduate in his academic field where his athletic credits have been used up, or does he take on other sports and continue, or does he get out of college after he has finished his competitive requirements? I mean that in the East our question is, how many of these boys go to college just for football or baseball? And I was just wondering how many of them went right on and graduated from the senior college after they had completed their two years of competition and yet had their two years to go in the senior college from the academic side.

PROFESSOR WILLETT: I haven't any figures to back up my impression, but I have the decided impression that on the Coast these junior college transfers go on and try for degrees in the same proportion that our ordinary college student does. There has never been any observable difference between the two groups.

I want to put in a word concerning the statement of Dr. Nelson. On the Pacific Coast our junior colleges draw from their own immediate districts. You do not find in even the large junior colleges a concentration of athletes from all over the state or from several states, because a boy to leave his own district to enter another junior college must pay a tuition fee. Consequently, even in a junior college of two or three thousand students you have only the normal products of that particular district on the athletic teams, but in the freshman class of even the small sectarian college you are apt to find a concentration of good talent drawn not only from the whole state, but from several states, or from a whole section of the country. Athletically, we consider that the four-year college, even though it is a small sectarian school, is on a higher level of competition than our district junior colleges where our problem is most acute. Therefore, we charge him with competition.

MR. HAYLETT (Kansas State College): I would like to ask—I know that you said you did not have inter-competition, that is competition between junior colleges and the small four-year groups. Now, if you did, would you count that as competition for the freshmen in junior colleges?

PROFESSOR WILLETT: If a junior college team competes against a four-year college team, the first year of that competition would be considered as freshman and the second as varsity.

MR. HAYLETT: In the Big Six, if a first year junior college man competes against a four-year college team, that is a year of competition, and his second year against a four-year college team is also. In other words, a junior college man who had played against a four-year college two years has already had two years' competition.

PROFESSOR WILLETT: We experimented with that plan and abandoned it.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: If there are no additional contributions, I think, if you intend to ask questions of each other, it would be best so far as possible to do it in private, because we ought to get down to a constructive program pretty soon.

PROFESSOR LARSON: In answer to Dr. Rockwell's question, I think in the Border Conference we have quite a few junior college transfers, and the athletes represent probably 10 to 15 per cent of the total number of transfers, and in general the transfers that do come from the various junior colleges of that area, of practically all states, are graduates. They do come for educational purposes primarily, and athletic secondarily.

MR. F. P. JOHNSON (Drake University): Dean Sackett, I should like to ask you a question, if you care to give the opinion of your Committee or your own personal opinion, as to what the objection might be to per-

mitting the immediate eligibility upon registration of a student who has completed a two-year course in a junior college, having gone there for economic reasons, the school being in his own locality. In a previous statement, I think you said that the N. C. A. A. Council frowned upon that practice of granting immediate eligibility. Would you care to state your objections to such a rule?

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: I think it would be inappropriate, but I will just give an illustration, because we are trying to find the solution, and what I said, being my personal opinion and not that of the Committee or of the Council, wouldn't be of special importance. We are trying to find a common ground now for the solution of an extremely difficult problem, but with us, our freshmen play the junior college team. That is the only equivalent competition that the junior college team has, and this is different from the practice of Big Ten.

Our freshman team is permitted to play a few games, some off the campus and some on, and the competitors are freshman teams of other institutions, and junior colleges. But we have the problem just the same, only in a smaller degree.

Now I don't know how far that is true in the Eastern states, the New England States, but it is with us. Dr. Rockwell, can you give us information concerning the New England States and the junior college so far as that problem has arisen?

DR. ROCKWELL: My only comment would be that most of our freshman teams, for instance, at Harvard and Yale and Brown, play our Academy teams. Our Academy teams are such good quality that they make good competition for the freshmen of our larger colleges, so the junior colleges really don't come into the freshman situation at all.

MR. HARSEN (Boston University): I do know that the practice varies in New England. Some of the New England colleges do not use transfers from junior colleges, whether they have or have not graduated. Some permit them to participate immediately if they have graduated from a junior college and are accepted as juniors in the college to which they have gone. But I am sure that there is no case in New England where the college or university would use transfers from a junior college who had not graduated from that institution. I think, in general, that summarizes the practice in New England.

PROFESSOR WILLETT: May I ask the gentleman a question? Would you allow students who had graduated from high school and gone into a preparatory school and competed to come in and compete in college?

MR. HARSEN: The preparatory schools, as far as athletic competition are concerned, are on the same basis as high schools.

PROFESSOR WILLETT: That is our favorite objection in the West. We see from some of these Eastern preparatory schools the type of athlete coming who is far superior both in ability and athletic experience to those who come up to us through our junior college system. Consequently, we penalize every boy from a preparatory school if he has previously graduated; if he has passed his 12th year we charge him with that preparatory school competition as if it were junior college competition, and to my personal way of thinking, we ought to do it, because I can cite you high-powered preparatory schools in the East where the competition is above that of the general run of junior college competition in the West.

MR. HARSEN: Might I say one word on that subject? I would commend you for that practice. We have a lot of preparatory schools in New England, but that action has not been taken in the case of any college or university that I know about. It seems to me that you are



getting at something fundamental, because I find very definitely that the boys who have become professional in attitude are those boys who have competed for so long a time that the game has lost all glamor for them; they do not play for the sake of the activity, and I think that when their competition is prolonged through a period of high school competition and through one or two years of preparatory school competition, and then through their college competition, that we have there the real professional in athletics, and I think that point is quite as important, or more important, than the dollars and cents that are involved. I think that amateurism is measured in terms of attitude quite as definitely as it is measured in terms of dollars and cents.

DR. ROCKWELL: There is an age limit, though, in that competition in high schools; they can't compete after twenty years of age.

MR. HASEN: That does not apply to the preparatory school.

MR. E. Z. MCKAY (Dickinson Junior College): Perhaps I can throw a little light on this situation. I represent Dickinson Junior College, at Williamsport, Pennsylvania, and as Dean Sackett has already said, we are one of the few junior colleges in the East that are having a lot of difficulty.

Now, you folks from out West have yours pretty well regulated. As a matter of fact, comparing it with ours, yours is perfect. I have tried time and again to have some of our junior college graduates, athletes, placed in some of our larger schools in the East. I get the answer back that until the N.C.A.A. takes some action, they are still considered transfers.

There are just a few exceptions in the East, and if anybody would like to ask me privately, I can tell you of some of those schools that claim that they have adopted a ruling similar to the Southern Conference where they will allow a boy, if he graduates from an accredited junior college, to come into the four-year college as a junior and play varsity ball right away. There are very few of those schools in the East, and they are not the larger ones, just the smaller schools. As a matter of fact, you can probably count them on one hand.

We are up against a situation in the East that has to be solved to be fair to our boys. I think that if a survey were conducted you would find that the junior college athletes that we have are not the so-called "tramp" athletes, or boys who were taken out of high school and placed in a preparatory school for three or four years until they try to develop their minds to such a point that they are able to do college work, and unfortunately, sometimes they never get to that point.

But I would like to have any information from you folks out West that you could possibly give, and I think that we are greatly concerned here in the East with the eligibility of a junior college graduate. Understand, I don't say anything about a boy who takes one year in a junior college and then goes elsewhere. I think the whole question is the eligibility of a junior college graduate, and where a boy takes one year in a junior college and then goes elsewhere it is just the same as going to a four-year school and taking one year and then going elsewhere.

We have quite a time in the East selling the junior college idea, primarily because it is fairly new, and another reason is the fact that this question of athletics has not been solved for us.

MR. BOCOCK (William and Mary): Would you mind telling me exactly what you mean by placing these boys in schools?

MR. MCKAY: Trying to get them into a school where they will be eligible for varsity competition.

MR. J. O. CHRISTIAN (Connecticut State College): We were confronted a couple of years ago with this junior college rule in our conference. The state colleges of New England, and our secretary, spent about a year in a little research through the different conferences of the country, and from that research arrived at a rule very similar to the one used in California. To summarize it briefly, it is this: that a junior college transfer coming into our conference who has completed his junior college work, is able to matriculate and is eligible for athletic competition immediately.

However, as to his total of competition, we take the position that his first year of competition in a junior college is equivalent to that on the freshman team of any college or university which he might attend, as most of these colleges have freshman schedules. So we take his junior college competition in each sport and subtract that from four, which would be really three years of varsity competition; so if he comes to us with two years of junior college competition he is eligible to compete for two years.

There is one term that is used a great deal that we have found differed throughout all these conferences, and that is, the term of graduating from the junior college,—just what is meant by it. We had a little trouble in getting any definite information on that, so we stated the rule somewhat like this. Any student transferring from a junior college who matriculates in any school in our conference as a junior is eligible, under the junior college rule. I think that is very similar to the rule in California.

I would also like to add that before coming East three years ago I coached and taught in a junior college, and I remember that for about eight years at every conference meeting we would discuss the problem of selling this junior college rule that we are arguing about here today to all the conferences. We would have representatives attend these conferences, and as far as I know now, most of them have junior college rules similar to the ones that have been discussed here today, with the exception of the Big Six and the Big Ten, and we had the same answer back every year from the Big Ten, and they are right on it; they have no freshman competition. Their freshmen are not allowed to leave the campus; therefore, they feel that a student coming in from a junior college has had a little advantage, and they still make them adhere to the one-year residence rule.

Now, another question comes up,—do we allow transfers coming from the small four-year college to compete? No, we do not. He has not yet completed his work in the four-year institution, and if we had such a rule it would open wide the possibilities of recruiting a good athlete from a small four-year college.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: Now is the opportunity for anybody to give us the answer. Does anyone have any suggestion as to a compromise or a temporary approach to a final solution?

MR. C. P. SCHOTT (West Virginia University): I would like to propose this as something to talk about: that junior colleges must be accredited in order to escape the transfer rule; that they must belong to some accrediting agency; that transfers from any junior college which does not belong to an accrediting agency be required to meet the same regulations that deal with regular transfers from any college. That would take care of the question that was brought up by Professor King, that students who come from the smaller junior colleges are not prepared.

I think that the survey that was made in California showed that the graduates from the junior colleges made better records in the institutions of higher learning than did those students who came up through freshman and sophomore years. Is that correct, Professor Willett?



PROFESSOR WILLETT: Substantially, yes.

MR. SCHOTT: As I remember reading the Bulletin, that is in substance what it stated. We have in West Virginia two junior colleges that are not accredited institutions. We do not accept their credits at West Virginia University, because they are not recognized. Students coming from these junior colleges are now eligible to participate in athletics, but their credits are not recognized. We accept them on the basis that, if they have finished the junior college and come with a recommendation from the principal, we will permit them senior college participation on the same basis that was mentioned here by Professor Willett and Professor Larson.

A second point would be that residence may be gained by attending a junior college, in order to participate in a senior college.

Third, that junior college competition be translated into senior college—that is, in the case of a transfer, if he has had two years in a junior college, then when he goes to a senior college those two years would count and he would then have only the two years left; that is, he would gain his freshman residence in the junior college, have one year of varsity, and he would have two years of varsity left in the senior college.

Fourth, the same academic regulations must be met in case of junior college transfers that operate in the senior college to which students transfer, in order to be eligible to participate. That is, in the case of a freshman or sophomore in a senior college, each college sets up certain academic eligibility regulations which must be met. In the case of a junior college transfer, when that student transfers the same regulations which obtain in the college to which he transfers should be applied to his record from the junior college.

Now, there was some question about recruiting. We read a great deal now about subsidization of athletes. I presume that the athlete who goes to the junior college is not of much account. If he were, some senior college would have him. I don't think we need to worry about the junior college transfer. That is, I doubt that any junior college athlete in West Virginia, if transferred, would make the freshman team at the University. So if the athlete is of any account at all, this question of recruiting is not going to enter into the picture, and since we want to take care of the college, we have plenty of rules in the senior colleges that might be corrected. For example, Professor Willett mentioned one, and it was brought out rather forcibly by the Chairman, that if a student has had two years of football in a junior college and goes to a senior college, he has two more years of football there; if he participated in track in a junior college for two years, but didn't participate in a senior college for two years, therefore he had five years of competition.

Why couldn't we recommend some regulation which would indicate that when a man has represented his institution three times, that ends his period of competition or representation. That is, normally, if he goes ahead as a freshman and comes in and meets a freshman requirement, then he has sophomore and junior and senior competition left; he has then competed three years. He may not compete in track in his sophomore year, but he didn't meet the requirements for graduation and he hangs over another year and then he is allowed that third year, or sort of a post-graduate year, in which to represent his institution in track. That gives him five years of college competition.

Now, we could eliminate a lot of these difficulties if we would just indicate that when he has competed, or represented his institution, for three years, that is where the freshman rule obtains,—that he has completed his years of participation in the senior college.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: Is there any further discussion of this subject? The differences are so numerous as well as so great that I think it would

be easier if we did not have so many different solutions of this problem. So few conferences have identical regulations, that if the number of different conditions could be reduced to two or three, it would seem to me easier to make an approach than where the differences are so many.

How, for instance, are we going to say, "Now, we will have a committee consisting of a representative here and there, and differences may be adjusted by joint action between the conferences and the committee"? We would have to have a committee that represented all of the conferences, and some additional areas that are not in conferences at all, in which there is no agreed solution of the problem.

Has somebody a suggestion as to how to approach this problem, looking toward an agreement, some compromise perhaps, so that conferences may consider something specific? Our differences are not between this point of view and that; they involve so many: the man who transfers at the end of one year, the institution which is accredited or not accredited, and the ramifications of the problem.

PROFESSOR WILLETT: I would like to ask, what is the fundamental objection to permitting conferences which are members of this Association to certify their athletes for N. C. A. A. competition on their conference rules, whether they be junior college transfers or not? Why do we single out the junior college transfer? There are differences in other connections. There are inequalities. It seems to me that in the long run, if a conference has conscientiously adopted certain rules applicable to its section of the country and its conditions, and if that conference has been accepted as a member of this Association, no great amount of injustice is going to be done if the members of that conference certify their athletes to the N. C. A. A. under their conference rules. As between the Pacific Coast Conference and the Big Ten, in the matter of junior college transfers there isn't any inequality; it is just a question as to when the competition takes place.

I should like to go back to the policy we adopted two years ago, and not single out the junior colleges for special legislation.

MR. JOHNSON: I would say, while not speaking with any authority, but just giving an opinion, that there are too many schools that feel that your conference has an advantage, or gains an advantage, in permitting a junior college transfer to be eligible immediately upon entrance after having served one year at the junior college. There is a certain amount of jealousy. Their conference limits them, but their conference does not vote as far as the N. C. A. A. is concerned; it is the institution that votes in limiting the competition as it is now limited by the N. C. A. A. rules.

DR. NELSON: I am quite in sympathy with Professor Willett's suggestion. It seems to me that with conferences organized and with the more or less similar regulation which we have, we are quite safe in accepting the principles under which each conference operates as giving as near equality as you could ask for in a situation as complex as athletic relations are. Hence, the question just raised a moment ago. I should think our directors in the schools which allow the junior college man to go right on at once would object from the other angle, because they would say the other fellows are all a year older and therefore a good deal more experienced than their own boys who go right ahead. But it seems to me the only possible weakness with respect to the suggestion of having certification made on the basis of the regulations of the conference of which the school is a member is the large number of schools which are members of the Association and not members of any particular conference. We would have to depend on them, of course, for their own specific institutional eligibility regulations.

But I feel that beyond a general statement of that kind, the National



Collegiate Athletic Association, until such time as it does assume the responsibility for regulating athletic eligibility rules in a more detailed fashion all over the United States, will have to stick to rather general principles.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: I think your position would be a very strong one if there were an agreement concerning the man who transfers from a junior college at the end of one year, and the total number of years that a man who begins in a junior college may compete, but there isn't that agreement which would make your position strong, and that is the reason I have been asking for approaches to this problem.

I can see, and all of us can see, how difficult it is, but as long as these differences occur between different conferences, I don't see how the National Collegiate Athletic Association can accept such a variety of solutions of one problem.

Now you have introduced others. It is true that the scholarship standards are not the same in all of the conferences. That is a question that could be appropriately brought up in some other connection, but our problem is how to rationalize the treatment of the student who goes to junior college, and it would seem to me that the first thing to be done would be to make an approach toward a uniform treatment of the junior college man so that there would not be so many different treatments of him. As long as it is possible for a man to compete five years, you have a serious argument against the general acceptance of the general statement even though the cases be extremely few.

PROFESSOR LARSON: I wonder if I understand you, Dean Sackett, on that matter of the five years of competition. Is that including that freshman year of competition, and then taking your varsity competition to come within a period of four calendar years?

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: In one sport, but I am talking about all sports.

PROFESSOR LARSON: That does include all sports, that you have a year for your freshman competition and then you have a period of four academic years in which to get in your three years of competition in all sports. Isn't that about the provision in your conference? It is in ours.

PROFESSOR WILLETT: I am curious to know if any of the schools do limit all competition, freshman and varsity, to a period of four years.

PROFESSOR LARSON: There are some conferences that do that.

PROFESSOR WILLETT: I wasn't aware of it. We limit all varsity competition to a period of four years.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: I think the Committee will have to have a season of prayer, according to all the evidence, and see what it can do. I had hoped that as we see the varying aspects of the subject we would be able to make some approach, to pass a milestone or two, in coming to an agreeable, working understanding, a method of conveying to certain conferences a particular ideal statement which you might have formulated, to see whether they would agree to it and so iron out their differences amongst themselves. I am trying to look at this as impartially as I can, not being involved in it very much, and yet seeing it come very definitely, and there is nothing like anticipating our difficulties, and this seemed an opportunity to get on our way toward the solution of the problem before it became any more aggravating and aggravated than it is.

I have no thesis in particular to propose to you as a solution. I can't see at the moment anything ahead for next year except the eligibility regulation that we have had, unless something comes right up here in the next minute or two in the way of a suggested solution that seems wiser

than anything that has been done so far. We tried doing exactly what has been proposed and there were serious objections from those who did not permit the same conditions and regulations to apply. Then we changed and we applied vigorously the transfer rule, and that is, I should say, equally unsatisfactory. But after all, if no approach is made toward ironing out the differences between the different conferences, I don't see that we are making progress toward an acceptance of your point of view concerning the solution of the junior college problem.

Well, this is clear to all of us, isn't it? We appreciate the point of view of the various conferences and the experiences which they have had, and those are important. The Pacific Coast Conference has had probably the largest, most extensive experience with this thing, and has tried to find various solutions and it has come to one, and that is an important matter. Likewise with the Colorado experience, which isn't as extensive. Then we come to the Missouri Valley and the Big Six where we see a difficulty; and the Southwestern, which agrees with California in its solution, in the main. So all that I can say is that I appreciate the fine spirit in which these various facets of the thing have been presented, and the committee will give very careful consideration to the matter and make such statements as it can to the Association when it meets.

DR. NELSON: May I ask if it would be within the prerogatives of this group to ask you to take from the members assembled here a straw vote as to the sentiment to determine how many of this group would favor the abrogation of the present regulation requiring the residence rule in the case of the junior college group, and how many would favor the maintenance of that rule for another year. Then your committee might find some compromise which would meet the situation and present a recommendation in which you could offset some of the objections, perhaps, to the present rule, as well as the objections to some other categories.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: It would seem to me you ought to suggest what would take the place of the rule, and if you suggest, as I have already mentioned, that the various conference findings be accepted, then they are quite numerous. There is not one obvious, clearly stated regulation in the case of the junior colleges in all of the conferences, but a variety of solutions. If there were one statement which was acceptable to all the conferences, I don't think there would be any question.

DR. NELSON: May I ask another question? This rule affects essentially track meets?

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: Swimming, boxing, wrestling.

DR. NELSON: Does it affect any sports that begin earlier than the close of the first quarter or first semester?

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: The only two cases we had last year referred to track.

DR. NELSON: Would it be possible to suggest that present regulations with respect to the various conferences should apply for students coming from institutions that are members of those conferences, with the further proviso that the student shall have been registered not later than September of the year in which he is to compete and have met up to the time of his competition the academic standards of that institution, and with the further proviso that he shall not be allowed more than three years of varsity competition in any one sport, and that those years of competition may not spread over more than four academic years, which I think is the general principle most institutions operate on? If you put those upper limits in with respect to totals, and put an academic restriction



that he must have registered in the institution in September in the year in which he is to compete, and have made a satisfactory record up to that point—

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: What is the reason that only two cases arose of students who had participated in junior colleges and transferred, and participated immediately after transferring? Why wasn't the number greater?

DR. NELSON: I think the answer is the one suggested here a moment ago. The average junior college student isn't apt to be the star who would go into one of these meets the first or second year, because if he were a star he would have been in senior college right at the start.

PROFESSOR WILLETT: I think there might have been junior college transfers certified from the Pacific Coast under the rule adopted two years ago, because, if I am not mistaken, the action of our Executive Committee was in the form of a recommendation to this Convention that the old one-year residence rule be reinstated. I think the record shows that that was in the form of a recommendation to the Convention, and as I understand it, it is not yet effective.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: There were only two cases brought up, and I was looking for an explanation of that small number. I wondered whether we were making much more out of the situation than the facts justified, or whether it just happened that the students, forewarned, had stayed away from competition, or hadn't applied for approval, or what. But it is surprising that, considering the length of time that junior colleges have been operating in the West, there were no more cases than these that came out in the open. But your explanation may be quite right.

PROFESSOR LARSON: When boys from my own institution, Arizona, compete—we will say in track—for the Penn Relays, that doesn't come under the N. C. A. A. regulations, does it?

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: No, it does not.

MR. LARSON: It is the National Meet at Chicago, usually, or California, that comes under that?

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: That is true. However, Professor Larson, we meet it a number of times. Such meets as the Drake Meet tend to conform to the National Collegiate regulations for participation, so that the boy who wins out there, or shows up well, is certainly eligible for the N. C. A. A.

MR. JOHNSON: We do conform strictly in the track meet.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: And I say that is becoming more and more the case with other similar meets of the country that are not themselves directly under N. C. A. A. operation.

MR. JOHNSON: The N. C. A. A. rules provide a very good standard for us to operate on, and for that reason we restrict our competition to those boys who meet the eligibility standards that you set up.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: Is there anything further? I think, Dr. Nelson, it would be worth while for you to write out the proposals which you made in a form so that we can have them.

PROFESSOR WILLETT: Is it clearly understood that the action taken by the N. C. A. A. two years ago did require members that were not members of conferences to comply with certain eligibility rules, including this

transfer rule for junior college students? The only institutions that were not required to comply with that rule were institutions that were members of conferences which in turn were in good standing members of this Association, so it doesn't really throw the whole thing wide open to go back to that policy. Your independent rules must meet the basic rules which include the transfer rule.

CHAIRMAN SACKETT: Well, the best we can do is to take the information and suggestions and material which have been provided for us and give the matter some further consideration, looking to the best solution of the subject that seems to be in sight. If there is nothing further, thank you very much, gentlemen. You have shown a fine spirit, and the information and advice which you have given will be given careful consideration.

...The meeting adjourned at four-ten o'clock...



## 2. ON SOME SMALL COLLEGE ATHLETIC PROBLEMS

A Round Table Conference on "The Problem of Intercollegiate Athletics in the Small College far Removed from Centers of Population" was held by the National Collegiate Athletic Association on Tuesday evening, December 29, 1936, at eight-fifteen o'clock, at the Hotel Pennsylvania, New York City, Professor C. E. Bilheimer, of Gettysburg College, presiding.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: I am sure we all feel very grateful to the N. C. A. A. for providing this opportunity of meeting here and discussing problems, especially those problems which affect the small institutions. Some of us have felt that for years when the delegates came to these conventions with specific problems the round table discussions we have had in former years have been very helpful, and we asked for a continuance of this and the N. C. A. A. very courteously granted us this opportunity of meeting and bringing up these problems.

I want this meeting to be rather informal and I have no set speech to deliver to you. If you have any question at all to discuss, will you write it out on a card and hand it in.

I hope that this meeting, or a continuance of such meetings, as Dean Nicolson has promised us for the future, will be an annual custom and serve as a clearing house for some of the things that men want to know concerning their individual problems. I think, if this custom is established, men will become more interested and know where to go on occasions when they have come to these meetings with something definite in mind. I remember one time when we had a meeting out in Chicago, Mr. Prentice came with a problem of athletic fees to discuss, and I was very glad that at that time I had a tabulation of results I got from the Second District, and I could help him out.

One question here is the price of admission to athletic contests. What do you have in mind about that?

PROFESSOR S. C. PALMER (Swarthmore): The question that has been bothering us a little bit at Swarthmore is what price should we charge for admissions to our games, and as something of an experiment this year we reduced the price of the football games in the middle of the season from a dollar to fifty cents. Now, that didn't work out very well in the middle of the season, because we lost quite a few dollars by the experiment. I wonder what it will do for another year. I questioned one or two other institutions about their price. One institution had reduced the price of admission to 40 cents and they told me there that they had not only very much larger crowds, but actually had greater returns on their games than they had before when they charged more. I don't know whether it is going to work out that way or not. Anyway, the solution with us is eventually to do away with an admission charge.

I don't know how soon that will be, but I know it is clearly in our president's mind that we don't take in enough anyway at our gates to make much difference, and we might have very much better and more enthusiastic crowds if we didn't charge admission at all.

I was asked the other day to look up how much we took in in the spring sports, and I was really surprised at the small amount. It was less than \$100 that we had taken in in all our spring sports put together. We might just as well have nobody on the gate at all as to collect a small amount like that. We charge nothing for soccer, anyway; our tennis never brings in anything. It is a question, then, of football and basketball.

We have been very much hampered at Swarthmore in our basketball situation because we had a very small gymnasium, and we had just about seats enough in there to seat half our college body. The result was

people didn't want to come. Most of you know we built a new fieldhouse at Swarthmore and we used it this year for basketball games; the University of Pennsylvania came down there to play and we had 1600 people in that new fieldhouse for that game. Of course, a good many of them were students, but the place was full.

We charge 50 cents and pay the taxes. We have two taxes in Pennsylvania to pay, the federal tax and the state tax. That means we get 43 cents for each paid admission. Undoubtedly, some of you have pretty much the same problem. They argued with us that if we put the price down it would more than make up for the loss in football, for example, by the increased numbers, but it didn't work out that way this fall. It may another year when the plan is a little better known. Perhaps some of you have some thoughts on the situation as to what you ought to charge for football in the small colleges. It might be useful to some of us.

PROFESSOR RIDER (Miami University, Ohio): We are possibly in a little different situation than Swarthmore. For example, our school is about half way between the little and the big.

PROFESSOR PALMER: How big?

PROFESSOR RIDER: We have about 2700 students at present.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: How many men?

PROFESSOR RIDER: A little over half. We have experimented on price levels, especially during the depression period, and that has always been with us as far as gate receipts are concerned. We are in a small town, and outside of our student attendance, of course, we never get very many patrons. Prior to the depression, and during it, and since, we have had two prices only. We uniformly had a \$1.50 price for reserved seats and \$1.00 for other seats, and that includes tax. That is, we pay the tax out of that price, and we have kept it standard.

We were advised by some of our people in our state that if we would lower the price a little more we would probably make more money. Some of the colleges tried it and invariably they were fooled and didn't make more money. I have come to the conclusion that when you get down to a certain figure you won't increase your gate receipts by lowering it below that; you will lose in spite of anything. In other words, if you establish a standard that is a fair rate, we will say \$1.00 or \$1.50 or 75 cents, I have a notion, and it seems to have worked out that way in our case, that there would be just as many people come and pay 75 cents as would come and pay 50 cents, or there will be just as many who would pay a dollar as there would be 75 cents, if those are your limits.

Now the caliber of the ball game does make a difference, whether it is one of your top-notch games or one of your so-called warm-up games, and certain people will come to one of your major games where for all the others they will go to the big ball park to see the big game, or stay home and listen to the radio if it happens to be a rainy day and the game is broadcast.

Our standard has been kept the same right through at all times, \$1.00 and \$1.50 for all of our football games, and we have had very little difference in attendance at any time. We charge \$1.50 for our Conference games and \$1.00 for all others.

In basketball we have reduced prices considerably since we got into a new building where we can seat three times as many people as we did formerly in the old building, and we have been charging 40 cents general admission for adults and 10 cents for children. With a 40-cent price, there is no federal tax applied; if it runs over 40 cents we would have to pay. But we have a state tax which is a gross 3 per cent. admission.



So we have had a uniform price for the last three years on basketball of 40 cents and 10 cents for children under twelve years of age.

We have lowered that price. We used to have 75 cents admission price when our capacity was very limited. Now we can seat 3500 people, and we, with our student population, practically fill the building for every ball game at 40 cents. We don't make any more money than we did when we charged 75 cents, but we make as much and we have a lot more people there and have room to accommodate them, and we feel that it is better to charge a lower price and make the same amount of money and satisfy a large number of people than to charge a higher price and have a lot of them stay away.

Spring sports for us don't pay the officials' expenses. In fact, half the time we have said, "Everybody come; there is no charge," and we pay officials' expenses and the guarantee and expect to do it without collecting anything at the gate. In some cases we may have a track meet and a ball game on the same afternoon, and a tennis match, possibly a golf match, all coming on the same afternoon,—on a Saturday afternoon, perhaps, when there are no classes,—and we have charged 50 cents in some cases, or 40 cents for the combination and have admitted the people to all sports, wherever they wanted to go. They could take them all in for 40 cents, and that has worked fairly satisfactorily; I think that a good deal of good will developed in our community by making it rather liberal, a low price, giving them what they think is lots for their money.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: What is the size of the town you live in?

PROFESSOR RIDER: Our student population is more than the town. We have a population of about 2300, I think, when the students are not in town.

PROFESSOR LIVINGSTON (Denison): A year ago we reduced the price to 50 cents for football games. Before that we had charged 75 cents. This year we put it up again to 75 cents, and we found we had the same crowd and a few more; from that experiment we have gone on charging 75 cents; but for our basketball games, we charge 40 cents general admission and 60 cents for reserved seats.

We charge nothing in the spring. We tried hard two years ago, with a good baseball team, to take in admissions money. We got a lot of gatekeepers, and so on. We didn't take in enough to pay for the gatekeepers, so we cut that out.

MR. G. F. THISTLETHWAITE (University of Richmond): I imagine our problem is common to the rest of you. I am interested to know what you are doing in other sections of the country. Briefly, we are confronted with this problem. There are six members of the Southern Conference in the State of Virginia. We have a sort of a conference within a conference; that is we have an organization, more or less a gentleman's agreement, between the six members of the Southern Conference schools in the state, and we have agreed upon a uniform price of \$2.00 for seats inside the 10-yard line at football games. Comparing our fields, we find we are running pretty close to the same number of seats, and we say there that the minimum price for those seats would be at least \$2.00. But it would work out this way. If you have a game in which there is a lot of excitement and intensive rivalry you will be able to sell those seats. If there is not much rivalry between two schools you are lucky to sell one-third of those seats at that price.

I think we all know that the price is too high. Just what the figure should be, I don't believe anybody in our section is able to say as yet. We have been trying to study the situation, and to put it down to \$1.10 may be the solution, but nevertheless, it goes right back to the question,

how much interest is there in this particular game? If there isn't much interest in the game you are better off to charge \$2.00 than you are to charge \$1.10, because they don't come anyway, and you will find the few who will come and pay the \$2.00 will net you more in the long run.

The same works out in basketball. We have but 600 seats we can put on sale to the public, because we must first take care of our own student body. If the game is one in which there is a lot of excitement, we can charge \$1.00 and we will sell all 600 of those seats, but if there isn't much excitement over the game and you put tickets on sale at 40 cents, you will still have empty seats, and it all comes right back to the question, how much interest is there in that particular game at that particular time, and we are in a quandary; we don't know whether there is any middle ground at all, but I am satisfied of this—if you gave away your athletics you wouldn't get any more people out; you would get more boys and youngsters that cause you trouble and run all over your field and so forth, but you are not going to have any more of the adult population who are vitally interested attending your games by reducing the price below some level. What that is, I don't know, but I am satisfied that it doesn't come down to the 40-cent class in our particular locality.

MR. O. F. CUTTS (Bates College): I think I am the only one from Maine here. We are off in the northeast section; we have our own problems and we have very good athletics. We have a good record, and we play good football and baseball. We have a gentleman's agreement in our little association of four colleges. There is one state institution, and Bowdoin is the oldest institution in the state. Colby and Bates are about the same size. Bates is co-educational and always has been from the start.

We have about 611 students, I believe, this year. About 350 of them are boys. At one time we charged \$2.00 a seat for our football games. We recently brought the price down to \$1.50. We have charged \$1.50 for the last two years for side line seats, charging \$1.00 at the end. We feel that we will get just as many people, practically, and more gross receipts from the \$1.50 than we would if we put it down to \$1.00. We do not feel that the amount of admission charged influences the crowd very much; they come on account of their interest.

Outside teams coming in don't draw the crowd that the Maine teams do. We are more or less provincial, I am sorry to say. I had the idea when I went back there that if we gave the state good football they would be interested and come to the games. They come only if there is a particular interest. This year we happened to have the set-up right. Bates usually plays Maine first, and then Bowdoin and Colby play the same day; then Bates and Bowdoin play, and we always have our last game with Colby on Armistice Day, Bowdoin and Maine playing the last Saturday before Armistice Day.

We find the interest intense in cases of rivalry; if they think we are going to be a winning team we will get a good crowd. This year we had almost all our seats taken. We put up extra seats and had the biggest crowd at the Bowdoin-Bates game we ever had at that game. We took in about \$3500 at the rate of \$1.50.

For the rest of our athletics we keep the admission fee at 40 cents so we don't have to pay any tax, and we feel that people will come at that price if they would come anyway. We don't charge for tennis. We don't get much attendance at indoor track, although almost all of us have good fields and indoor tracks.

Bates has not played basketball for fourteen years. We are starting the game this year with a freshman team, and will go on and play it next year, as the University of Maine competes in that sport. We did formerly, until this year, play hockey, but Maine doesn't play hockey, and now it is Bowdoin and Colby playing hockey and Bates and Maine



playing basketball. I think both of the other colleges will come around to basketball very soon, but that seems to be our situation.

There is nothing, it seems, we can do to increase our gate. We can put on the best contest in the world; if there happens to be competition, a case of winning teams, we will get the crowd. If we don't have that situation we don't get the crowd. We can't do a thing about it. It is a problem with us to support our athletics, but we do have very good competition and a very good grade of athletics all through. We have good teams. We sometimes play teams out of our class. We have played Dartmouth, Harvard, and Holy Cross. One year we happened to have games scheduled with Holy Cross, Dartmouth, and New York University, the three teams that were contenders for the Bowl competition, and of course that is a mistake, but our coach and our men feel they like to play these games. They don't feel that the competition is any keener, any harder, with more danger of injury, in a game with Harvard or Dartmouth than there is playing a game with a smaller college, but our boys get the experience of going against good players. They like to play the big teams. If they can't play on them they like to play against them. They like to show what they can do. I don't think it is any injury to them. We don't go to play on their grounds unless we get good guarantees. We need those guarantees to support our athletics. We try to run a purely amateur sport, and we do. We have had the rules which you have been talking about here in this Association for years. All our men have been members of the faculty, all our coaches, the year-around coaches; they do all the work of the department.

I am head of the department now, and I haven't coached for some years, but we have the problem of getting the money to support the grade of athletics we want to carry on and do our physical education work. That is about our situation.

MR. N. A. KELLOGG (Lehigh University): It is a rather curious experience to me to have college football in a town where the high school outdraws us. Now I know, and for very logical reasons, if you have a high school football team which is pretty well up in contending for, say, the Eastern half of the state championship, or the state championship, and your college football team is way down, with all the local support of the high school, including the parents and all the relatives, the brothers and sisters and everything like that, of the high school football players, they have the edge on you if they play good football. In Bethlehem, Liberty High School has had uniformly good teams over a period of years when Lehigh's teams weren't very good, and if you have two games the same day with the scale of high school prices that normally prevail, and with the scale of university prices that normally prevail, the high school will outdraw you two or three to one.

What we have tried to do there has been a sort of compromise, as everything else is. We have tried to keep our self-respect as a college team by charging for the selected seats what we felt were, I wouldn't say real college prices, but sort of a compromise. Last fall, we put in reserved seat prices between, let us say, the 20-yard lines, at what would be considered college prices at our level. Then we had a general admission from the 20-yard line to the goal line, which was down to about the high school admission price for all their seats, because they don't as a rule sell reserved seats; and then, across the end of the field we even undercut the high school; we let the general public in at the end of the field behind the goal line at 25 cents.

Now, that is an awful problem, isn't it? But on the other hand, we took in a pretty appreciable amount of money there, and we have hopes, of course, that if the high school slips one of these days and the university team goes better, that we can sneak up on the public and raise those prices appreciably. It is a question in many cases of what the traffic will bear.

Of course, the ideal that has been spoken of recently by some people is that admission should be free. Until they are ready to carry the burden for us out of university funds, we can't have free admission unless we are very heavily endowed. I think as long as the public wants to come to see our games we are justified in charging a reasonable amount; not all the traffic would bear, because we used to do that. It wasn't so long ago that the Lehigh-Lafayette games were priced at \$4.40. You couldn't get it. Now we are tickled to death to sell the best seats we have for \$2.20, and we will sell them behind the goal line for 50 or 75 cents.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: What scale of prices do you have there, the reserved seat prices?

MR. KELLOGG: That depends on the game. We have never cut the Lehigh-Lafayette game before below \$2.25, with unreserved seats. The Lafayette set-up is a little different than ours. They are able to sell seats on the side of the field, from about the 10-yard line down, at \$1.10. We have sold seats at the end of the field for the Lehigh-Lafayette game for \$1.00 this year, and in some of our earlier games we sold reserved seats, center section, including all tax—and some of you people who don't live in Pennsylvania don't have to pay the Pennsylvania tax, which is two cents on every quarter—all taxes included, reserved seats for 75 cents and we were glad to have it.

MR. CUTTS: For the preliminary games, we have never charged over 75 cents or \$1.00.

MR. KELLOGG: Of course, what I was saying does not apply to our student body at all. Our student body has a fixed fee as part of the university fees, and for that fee, which is \$15 a year, they have center section seats at all the home games, and for the Lafayette game at Easton they also have center section seats without any additional charge. If they go to Penn State, or any other place except the Lafayette game at Easton, they have to pay. We have an agreement with Rutgers whereby the price is half, but our student body, for their athletic tax, get center section seats right in the middle of the main stand on our South side, which is the home stand, for all games at no charge whatever beyond their original purchase.

MR. ALVIN JULIAN (Muhlenberg): We have very much the same situation at Allentown as Lehigh has at Bethlehem. We have a high school there that draws a lot of interest. I knew they charged \$1.00, 50 cents, and 25 cents. We played Lehigh this year and had a pretty fair crowd, I think, yet the receipts, I imagine, were a little bit disappointing.

We charged \$1.10 at Allentown for all our games this year, regardless of whom we played, and while in one game we just about broke even, we came right back with the same caliber team next week and made a real nice profit, and I just wondered what the experiment turned out to show, because we have the much same problem, Col. Kellogg, with Allentown High School. They just pack them in, eight and ten thousand every ball game, and sell maybe a thousand season tickets, and then give the preference to the season ticket holders, the preference for two tickets on Thanksgiving Day at \$1.50, and they sell out in two days. So that is a problem we have to confront, and I just wonder if your experiment proved successful or if it didn't.

MR. KELLOGG: There are so many factors that enter into any given season, you know. There is the caliber of your own team, and that of the visiting team. Now, on the face of the gate receipts and the returns, we did better this year by lowering our prices, and don't forget that this year we had our contract where all the students got in free on their



coupon books. We took in more cash at the gate in spite of that than we had for two or three years before. Your team was better; our team was better.

Now, as I said, you have so many trick circumstances connected with any given football game, that is, weather, the roads, and whether your team is going well. I say it is very, very hard to set down any hard and fast, specific things about your comparative receipts on individual days.

Now, I will admit to you, gentlemen, that it hurts me to have Liberty High School sold out and people who can't buy their tickets come over to see Lehigh play Gettysburg, or Muhlenberg, because they can't get into Liberty High, but that is the situation sometimes.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: Am I right in assuming, Colonel, that Allentown and Bethlehem High Schools, on Thanksgiving day, each made \$10,000 a game?

MR. KELLOGG: I don't think so.

MR. JULIAN: Yes, they did.

MR. KELLOGG: I don't think they made that much apiece.

MR. JULIAN: A member of our Athletic Council at Muhlenberg is Chairman of the Athletic Council of the high school, and they tell the Faculty Manager that they want \$10,000 net gate receipts for a Thanksgiving Day game, and they set their price at \$1.50 and sell those tickets. It is very unusual, but it is a fact. I am telling you that for three days before the Bethlehem-Allentown game they advertised in the Allentown papers, "Please do not come to this game unless you have a ticket; you will not be admitted."

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: It is all very interesting. Does anyone else have anything to offer?

At Gettysburg we charge 75 cents for general admission, of which we get 65 cents and 7 cents goes to the government and 3 cents goes to the state, and for reserved seats we charge \$1.25 and we receive \$1.09 for ourselves, when we have reserved seats.

For basketball we charge 40 cents, and for baseball we charge 25 cents, and we are lucky to get in enough money to pay the umpires.

MR. W. B. WILSON (Kansas Athletic Conference): I represent not one school, but six schools in Kansas, the Kansas Athletic Conference, and they are all church schools, and I was just thinking, as I listened here, that I wished we could get \$2.00 for every seat at the games, but in football the maximum is \$1.00, and more commonly they sell the tickets for 75 cents for football and 50 and 40 cents for basketball.

We often find that we don't take in enough at the gates to pay the officials, especially if we get a fine class of officials, which we always try to do. We have a Commissioner in our conference who takes care of that, that is, for a small fee, but lots of times, if it is a bad day and the game isn't very interesting, we won't take in more than enough to pay the officials.

PROFESSOR PALMER: Would you get more if the price was lower?

MR. WILSON: No, we would lose money then worse than ever.

PROFESSOR F. W. MARVEL (Brown): What is the experience of these men who have the two priced tickets on the sides of the field? How are they able to keep the people who bought low priced seats in them? (Laughter)

For several years we have tried, I think, all kinds of ways of reducing prices, and I am very confident that every time we have reduced a price we have lost money, and I do not believe that you can put your prices down, then when you have a good team put them up, because people won't stand for it.

But the question I would like to see answered is, how do you keep those men in those seats? I am asking that question because of an experience we had on our own field, and experiences we have had when we played on other fields. I find that there are a lot of cheap seats sold, but nobody sits in them.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: Has anyone been able to solve that problem?

PROFESSOR MARVEL: We had some figures on that for this year. Our stands go up to a peak, so we have 76 rows in the middle of the field, and they come down to about a dozen or fifteen rows on the 5-yard line, and seats low down in the middle of the field are not as good as the seats higher up on the 5 and 10-yard line. This year we put some 55-cent seats on sale outside of the 5-yard line and we spent quite a lot of money putting barriers up there. We increased our police force to keep the people over there, and we brought in about 60 or 75 deadheads, to keep them over there, and in the third period, about 75 per cent of the people who bought the low-priced seats were not sitting in those seats; they had all gone over to the higher priced ones.

Two years ago, at a Thanksgiving Day game, our prices were \$2.50, plus tax, and two days before the game, after the time we were not refunding on tickets, we put out some \$1.10 seats and we practically didn't sell any more \$2.50 seats, but we had everybody coming back trying to get a refund on the \$2.50 seats and trying to buy the \$1.10 seats, and I don't think we sold hardly any tickets at the regular price, and there is no question but what we lost considerable money. But I would like to ask that question, what your experiences are in keeping men in those seats? We can't do it even with barriers and all the police force, and the people that are inside, that have paid the full price, are the ones that kick; they are kicking because the other people get the same thing they get for half the price.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: Can anyone offer a solution for this problem?

PROFESSOR MARVEL: It can't be done.

MR. KELLOGG: It can be done if you have the proper fences. That is a difficult problem. Now, you cannot control the cheap-price crowd by any small barrier or by any police force, especially if the police force come from the same town in which the cheap-price crowd are voters. Don't forget that. I expect, Mr. Marvel, you have tried that.

The only way that you can control your cheap-price crowd is if you have the opportunity to build a stadium with the benefit of the experience of other people who have built stadiums, and when you build that stadium, provide for a series of movable fences which can be set in any aisle and are about 10½ feet high and bull-proof. If you can start a plant from the bottom, with the experience of Ohio State, for instance, with the movable fences, and make provisions when you build your stadium for real, portable, what they call out in the Middle West hard, tight, and bull-proof fences, you can control your crowd. But it takes a lot of hard planning.

Now, it was not done successfully at our Charity Games. Out there, in 1930 and 1931, where we had \$3.30, \$2.30, and \$1.10 prices, we sold a lot of \$3.30 seats, we sold almost no \$2.30 seats, and thousands of \$1.10 seats, and when the whistle blew all the \$1.10 people were over in the \$2.30 and \$3.30 stands.



You have to build your stadium with that in view from the bottom up, and it can be done if you know before you start your stadium what you want to do.

DR. A. C. NELSON (University of Denver): Since this particular phase has been injected into the discussion, I want to tell you of our experience, which apparently is unique. In the City of Denver we have a very large Boy Scout organization. The University of Denver for years now has been very successful in segregating the general admission people at \$1.10 from the reserved seat people at \$1.50 or \$2.20, as the case may be, with no difficulty at all by making the barrier a line of Boy Scouts in uniform.

Curiously enough, the public does not seem to be willing to over-run the Boy Scouts. They have the backing, of course, of their Scout Master. All the boys and their Scout Master get to see the game without charge, have good seats, and they are happy to render that service without any expense to the organization at all, and we have had no difficulty whatsoever in segregating them. I have seen games in our stadium when there were three or four full sections between the outermost reserved seat and the line of general admission, with no tendency to over-run them. Some of you might try it if you have enough Boy Scouts in your town; it may work.

PROFESSOR FREDERICK W. LUEHRING (University of Pennsylvania): We did that at Minnesota, too, and it worked well. We just turned over the entire ushering problem to the Boy Scouts with their leaders and they were organized; they were on their honor, and they were on time and they did a beautiful piece of work. We tried paying the students something for ushering, and they would be running all over the place all the time and watching the game, while the Scouts did a beautiful piece of work and they got a lot of educational satisfaction out of it as well as experience, feeling that they did render a social service. I certainly could recommend the plan.

PROFESSOR MARVEL: I seriously object to that kind of work, for a Boy Scout to be doing that in uniform.

PROFESSOR LUEHRING: I would say they like to do it; they keep asking for it.

PROFESSOR MARVEL: I wouldn't allow my Boy Scout Council to permit it.

PROFESSOR LUEHRING: Of course, Mr. Marvel is a Boy Scout Commissioner. Now the Boy Scouts asked for the chance with us at Minneapolis, and the Minneapolis Scouts every year would come over with a delegation asking if they couldn't do this. It meant something to those boys to see those football games and it was a service the crowd appreciated, and they did the ushering better than the students did it. The whole thing was just a big worry off of our hands.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: Has anyone else any questions? I think we have given that a lot of time.

MR. CUTTS: I would like to speak of a scheme we tried a year ago and it worked out so well we tried it again this year. Of course, we have the plan, as all colleges do, of having a student tax, so the home students go to the games without any admission charge, and they occupy the center of the field; but for a year now in Maine we have had an agreement with the other colleges that visiting students of Bates, for instance, going to Maine, will have a student rate of 55 cents, while the regular charge would be \$1.50. They have the best seats, of course, in the center of the stands that the home college gives them at a charge of

55 cents. Those tickets are sold at the home college and must be sold only on presentation of the coupon books, or the Athletic Association card, and then the students are identified at the college where the game is being held by the visiting college representative, either the Director or some one whom he appoints.

That has worked out very well in the Maine colleges. It has worked so well that we are continuing it for next year and probably indefinitely. We have been unable to have a student group following our team until these last two years since we have adopted that plan, but we have had this year more Bates students going down to the University of Maine, and we were able to get a special train. Of course, that made a difference, but it has worked out splendidly to get the student interest and the student appreciation.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: Here is a question we are asked to discuss, "What is the general practice among the smaller colleges concerning responsibility for injured players; first, the coach, second the trainer, and third, the medical director?"

MR. VALENTINE LENTZ (St. John's College): In case of football injuries, we have a physician and also an infirmary in which we take care of our men to the best of our ability, and if it is a case that needs extra attention, the Athletic Association takes care of it.

While I am on the floor, I might say we are probably one of the rare institutions that are budgeted as a department of the college rather than a separate athletic department, and we have practically no gate receipts.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: Do you feel that the college is responsible for the injuries which a football player receives?

MR. LENTZ: I think all the colleges in the country today are taking care of sickness and other illnesses that occur within their own physical education program, and I see no reason why they should not be responsible for those occurring in football. The college students who go to colleges and universities, I believe, pay a fee for that particular protection.

MR. S. C. ABELL (University of Vermont): What I am mainly interested in is the responsibility of determining whether the boys should play or not,—where the responsibility lies; if you were to have a serious outcome of an injury to a football player, who would be considered responsible, who is considered responsible in the majority of the colleges,—the medical director or the coach, and who has the authority to forbid participation; what is the general practice?

MR. LENTZ: I have been interested in listening to the discussion regarding the dividends that are being paid to the various departments from the football gate receipts. Down through the South we had quite an experiment in regard to night football and it has done very well. Most of the institutions have played their early season games at night and more than doubled or tripled their receipts. In the City of Baltimore, particularly, the high schools were lucky, probably getting formerly \$50 or \$60 a game, but I think most of the high schools in the City of Baltimore at the present time, playing night football, have increased their receipts from approximately \$50 or \$60 to over \$3000 or \$4000 a night.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: Mr. Abell, you had in mind the man's injuries, and who is responsible for his going back in the game.

MR. ABELL: Either into the game, or as to whether he should continue the season.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: My only answer to that would be the medical director, personally.



MR. ABELL: Is that generally accepted?

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: I think it is in most of the colleges; the medical director would be the man responsible for the injured player. I don't think it is the coach's responsibility at all. Am I right in that?

DEAN SACKETT (University of Pennsylvania): I think there is an important professional question right there. For your own defense in case of suit, the final decision ought to be made by a physician, then you are on the safe side. If the coach or the director makes a decision, and he is not an M.D., it might lead to unfortunate complications.

I think that is a safeguard we ought to be pretty careful to employ. These little injuries may sometimes turn out to be more serious than appears on the surface, and we are all recognizing it by the fact that in the case of football we are providing for the care of the boy after he is injured, with hospitalization, for instance, the care of teeth in case they are broken, and so on, which is an indication that we are accepting the responsibility. Very well; our best defense is to have a physician pass on the case.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: I might cite you a test case. The fact is that the college is not liable unless it has been proven negligent in handling the case, but morally, I have felt for some time that we are liable, so I think we have a moral obligation to the boy to take care of him if he is injured; and of course, the medical director ought to be the man to give the final O.K. on any boy playing football.

PROFESSOR PALMER: I think there are some institutions that do not have a medical man on their staff. It makes it a little difficult.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: Does that answer that question?

MR. ABELL: The reason I raised that question is because in the New England Conference meeting it was pointed out there were two or three players used in large college games who physically should not have been in the games; and I wondered whether the small colleges were as well equipped, and if such were the case, whether the medical directors had the authority or whether they should have the responsibility of determining whether a boy should play or should not play.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: I think, in any event, if there is no medical director connected with the college, a team physician should be employed and he should have the final O.K. I mean for the smaller colleges.

MR. G. P. DOHERTY, JR. (University of Delaware): We are probably different from any other institution in the fact that we are the only institution of higher education in the state. It is a state institution, and for a number of years we have invited the teams of the different high schools in the state to attend one of our home contests. It occurred to me this year that we might make a little money and help ourselves in this way. We have been charging a regular rate of \$1.00 for our home games. I think a year or two ago we charged 75 cents, and found that, adding eight cents to that for the tax, we just couldn't find enough pennies anywhere to make the change, so we went back to a dollar charge.

Now, when we invite these boys up we admit them to the game on a complimentary ticket, by paying a 10-cent tax. I would like to know if anyone else has had this experience, or whether or not we could just say that we will charge these high school boys a service charge of 10 cents and not turn it over to the government. It came out very clearly this afternoon in the general meeting that we are no more than an internal revenue tax collector if we do that sort of thing. Of course, our general admission is a dollar. We admit children up to twelve or fourteen years

for 40 cents. Usually high school students on teams will be a little older than that.

Does anyone have any opinion about whether it would be feasible to just put a service charge on and not call it a tax,—whether we would be violating any law?

PROFESSOR PALMER: What is your state law?

MR. DOHERTY: We have no state law; it is a federal tax.

PROFESSOR PALMER: In Pennsylvania we have a state law and we have to pay one cent on twenty-five cents or fraction thereof. We do let some of the kids in for 10 cents, but we have to get a penny out of them. So we have a lot of different taxes in the different states.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: We have a situation at Gettysburg. We have an organization known as the Junior Bullets, taking all the grade school children and the children around town there and admitting them free through a certain gate and giving them a certain section in the grandstand.

Now, the law reads in that case that those youngsters are not subject to tax, but I think with the high school teams, admitting them, they have to pay the 10-cent tax.

PROFESSOR PALMER: If you publish a rate of 25 cents, or 10 cents for children, would you have to collect anything?

MR. DOHERTY: I think we would. If we say twelve years of age, then these high school youngsters are older than that.

PROFESSOR PALMER: Suppose you say children?

MR. DOHERTY: I don't know whether you could decide on where that age ends.

MR. KELLOGG: I have somewhat of a same idea. We had that question two years ago. We have at Bethlehem a very hard old bunch of steelworkers, and it is cheaper on wear and tear on your equipment if you let them in somewhere where you can control them than leave them outside where they have to fight their way in.

We had no trouble at all with the government tax, but we set up a general admission of 40 cents and let the kids in after the first quarter; but when the state tax came on, we took the matter up with the State Department and they ruled if we had admitted children below a certain age—we didn't specify it; they were usually high enough to go under a gate about so high, no doubt bending down—they ruled we did not have to collect any tax for them.

I never have taken it up with the federal authorities. I think your best bet is, if you have \$1.00 admission and no state tax, to charge 91 cents; that is, your fixed price is 91 cents, plus 10 cents tax, because you have gone over the fraction line; make it \$1.01, knock off your cent, and give them a fixed price of \$1.00, which you are entitled to do, and lose a cent every time, and collect 9 cents from them, or 10, whichever you please.

MR. DOHERTY: I am not talking about our general admissions. I am talking about these teams from the different high schools in the state which we would like to have come to our State University.

MR. KELLOGG: I don't believe you can get away from the federal law unless you pay, or they pay. If the officials don't come and inspect you and check your gate, all right; but I don't believe, legally, you can get away from paying the tax.



PROFESSOR RIDER: We asked that same question. We took it up with the authorities and discovered that you can't admit a boy for 10 cents, or 25 cents, into a section that is advertised for \$1.00 without paying the tax on the \$1.00 admission; but if you establish a reserved section for high school boys, say, and charge 10 cents, then you are exempt; if, however, those boys come in on a 10-cent ticket, then go to the dollar section, you have to pay the other price.

I think we all agree that after the first kick-off the boys move over to another section, but the tax collector can't get you for it. You have made your attempt to collect according to the guarantee that here is a section for them; if you do your part to the best of your ability, they can't come back and collect more. But you have to have it advertised that here is a dollar section; if the ten-centers go to the dollar section you won't have to pay a tax on them.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: Mr. Doherty, I think you had another problem that you raised at one of our meetings on the question of awards.

MR. DOHERTY: I think that was more or less a case of where we had been awarding letters on what the members of the team said they thought were too rigid requirements, and we did try to find out what other institutions that had swimming and track decided upon in awarding letters or monograms, whatever they do award, for members of those teams.

I remember now that Dean Mercer said he thought every man who participated on the team should have a letter, whether he played in a certain game or whether he played a certain number of minutes. Of course, in swimming and track, as I recall, our regulation was that a man had to score so many points in dual meets, or place in a certain position in a championship meet as far as swimming was concerned, and the same applied to track. I would like to know whether others do the same sort of thing, and about what the degree of difficulty is in regard to winning a letter in those particular sports; that is, swimming and track.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: Can anyone give us any light on that? Your thought was that a man who participates in track might be a member of a very poor team, not earn any points in the season as required by letter requirements, and still represent his institution and be deprived of that letter. Is that it?

MR. DOHERTY: I think that a lot depends on the competition you are in. We tried to draw up some regulation that, if our team is competing in a small championship, for instance, like the Mason-Dixon Conference that started a couple of years ago in which there might be twelve or fifteen teams competing, he wouldn't have to score as many points as if he were in a meet in which there were only five or six teams competing; that is, his chance of scoring points, possibly, with the fewer number of teams competing would be better than if he were in a larger group.

PROFESSOR PALMER: At Swarthmore we require them to make 10 points in dual meets in track to get their letter, and the same thing, I think, in swimming. I think we were contemplating making some change in it, but I don't think anything has been done yet. We found that that works out very well and about the proper number get their letters. Of course, there are some who don't get them, but I don't think they feel it is a hardship at all.

PROFESSOR LIVINGSTON: At Denison, in the dual meets, they must make three points a meet, or in the high coverage they must make at least a fourth place in any one event.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: I think that practice is universal,—a certain number of points in a season.

Has anyone else a problem they would like to bring up? We still have a little time.

MR. DOHERTY: What is the general policy of awarding letters in major or minor sports? Is it possible to ask how many colleges award the same letter for all sports and make no discrimination between major and minor sports, or if colleges do discriminate between the sports? For instance, awarding a certain size letter for football, baseball, and track, and another letter for minor sports such as tennis, golf, and fencing.

MR. GEORGE LITTLE (Rutgers): We have a problem now about giving too many letters, and I thought I would make a little investigation by mail as to what institutions of our size did, and see if the practice can't be a little bit better stabilized. We give about twenty letters normally, and have an opportunity of giving a service award to a man if he continues three years, but the objection among the competitors to the service award is that it might be all right to give him a minor letter, but not a major letter. There is considerable feeling about it at the present time.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: Do you give different letters for every sport?

MR. LITTLE: Yes. We have never worked out a system whereby we have no minor sports, but all sports have equality. We need, I think, to make a recommendation whereby we eliminate all minor sports, as some of the institutions where I have served before found it quite beneficial to do.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: There has always been a question in my mind as to whether there should be such a thing as a major or a minor sport.

MR. KELLOGG: Of course, when you come to discuss this question of awards, you get into many varying situations in the various institutions, and, as was said this morning, I can't for the life of me see why we should all be uniform in this matter. Now take the institution which I represent. We have two major sports. One is football and one is wrestling. In most of your institutions wrestling is a very minor sport. There are times, and have been times, at Lehigh when wrestling overshadowed football.

I have just taken it upon myself, after the rush of the football season, to begin with 1924 and look at the proceedings of the Board of Control of Athletics, which lasted up to the fall of 1932, when it was abolished by presidential and Board of Trustee action; and I found that from 1926 until 1932 a great part of the Board meetings were devoted to discussing what type of letter they should have, what should be major and what should be minor sports, and they changed every year.

We put the question up to the Arcadia, which is our student body corresponding to the Student Council, or whatever you have in your institutions, and there was no unanimity on the Board. You had a group of students one year, more or less *ex officio*, who were football, baseball, and track men, and they thought football, baseball and track should be major sports; the next year you had a group that represented soccer and lacrosse and basketball, and they thought those ought to be the major sports.

After six years the Board of Control finally came to the point where they decided that all sports were of an equal value. Now that is open to discussion, of course, but they set the plan up before I went there, and, in spite of some pressure from time to time, I see no reason to change. We give the same letter in every sport we sponsor.

There are some unofficial sports which we don't sponsor, which we permit to use a modified letter, because I think if you have a club like fencing, or golf, which goes out and pays its own expenses, traveling,



guarantees to visiting teams, equipment and all that, and carries on a reasonable program with eligible students, that they really ought to have some letter.

Now, you support the tennis team and you give them letters; here is a golf team that plays about as many matches and with about as good a record, and you don't support them. You shouldn't deny them something. You had better supervise the rules, supervise the awards, to see that they don't give more letters for instance, than you do in the sports you support, but they are entitled to some consideration. But in 1932 the Lehigh Board of Control went to uniform letters and we have continued them, and of course, as I said, that is open to a lot of argument. You have a Middle Atlantic champion in track; you have an Eastern Collegiate champion in wrestling; you have the weakest member of the weakest football team that you have had in fifteen years, and all get that same letter. Now, the strongest member of the strongest team you have in fifteen years may think he ought to have a letter twice as big as the track man's. You all have been through that. You know what it is all about, but you rather have to smooth the whole thing over and do justice to all.

We couldn't decide by vote here what are the major sports—outside of football; we will leave that. Football is our major sport, sure, but as for the rest—Delaware has swimming; Rutgers has swimming. Our swimming is not a major sport at all from the standpoint of the public; ours is wrestling.

PROFESSOR LIVINGSTON: Of course, I am a believer that we all, eventually, will get to all sports having one award. At the present time there are quite a few who believe that sports like football and basketball and track require more work and more labor, you might say, by the individual members of the teams than does a golf team that goes out every afternoon with their package of cigarettes in their hip pockets, and has a good time with the instructor not always there; and the tennis boys go out and have a lot of fun; whereas the football teams go out, of course, on rainy days and in the mud and ice and snow and they work hard.

MR. KELLOGG: What about the high jumper who trains two days a week?

PROFESSOR LIVINGSTON: He should train more than that.

MR. KELLOGG: But lots of them don't, nor the broad jumpers. There is where you can't justify yourself on your distinctions.

PROFESSOR PALMER: We perhaps do a little different thing than most of you do. We give practically the same letter for everything. We have no minor sports. That is, the shape of the letter is the same, but we modify the sweater, and we have modified it in about ten ways now.

PROFESSOR MARVEL: I have been hearing these questions debated for forty years in two institutions, and I agree with Mr. Kellogg, that in the old days most of our time and most of our minutes—I read them through myself the other day—were devoted to awards. I feel that the fewer regulations you have, the fewer rules you have, and the simplest way you have of awarding letters is very much better, and you won't have to meet so many fond parents, fathers and mothers, after the awards are made if you have a set of very simple rules.

A few years ago some of the boys felt we should have special recognition for a man who won his letter three times in the same sport. If we have a man who wins his letter three times in the same sport, he gets a brown letter on a white sweater, and I think that the prize the boys are working for now is to get that white sweater.

We do one other thing. I have worked out this scheme, that when a man graduates, if he has won his varsity letter in any one of our sports, either golf or tennis or fencing, he will get a gold stick, if it is hockey; in baseball, a gold baseball; in tennis, a gold tennis racket. He will get one of those with his name on it and the word "Brown" on it, and they prize those very, very highly, and no man ever gets more than one and he has to graduate to get that. Those are very simple rules and regulations.

And one other thing. When a man graduates we give him a diploma. He only gets one. If he wins his "B" three times a year for three years, when he graduates, along with those gold souvenirs he will get a "B" diploma, and on that will be inscribed his record. He can frame it, and there is his athletic record for the three years he was in college.

Those are very simple rules, and we have done away with all our rules and regulations as to how many minutes in a game a boy plays or how many games he plays in football, or how many points he gets in track. I was a track man myself, and I saw a man leaving Brown with a "B" who won a pole vault at ten feet, and a man who got beaten in ten seconds in the hundred-yard couldn't get one. When we get through the season, our coaches make a recommendation that the following men be awarded a varsity letter. A clerk makes a record as to how many minutes each has played in each sport, or how many points he has won, how many times he has been out for practice. And in addition to the coach's recommendation, the captain recommends the men he thinks should be awarded the letter, and then the matter goes to an undergraduate athletic council, and they recommend the men they think should get the letter; then the Director has to make a recommendation, and that goes to the Senior Council and they make the final award. It is very simple, because about all four of those same people will recommend the same groups of men; everybody has had a chance at it, and when the father comes around and says, "Why didn't my boy get a letter?", we reply that the coach, the captain, and the unprejudiced council and other councils think he doesn't deserve it; we are very sorry, but that is all there is to it.

PROFESSOR Z. G. CLEVINGER (Indiana University): In regard to awards, I would say that at our place it is a very simple matter. We have just one award, one letter for every sport. The rules and regulations are rather simple. They must be recommended by the coach, approved by the Director, and voted by the Athletic Committee. But on our committee there are no students. It is a faculty group.

Now, we do give one award to the man who earns it for the third time in that sport. He is allowed to have a sweater with leather sleeves.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: Are there any other questions you would like to bring up? Has anybody anything to present?

MR. W. J. STEVENS (Drexel Institute): I move that we extend a vote of thanks to the N. C. A. A. for having this round table conference.

MR. KELLOGG: I second the motion.

... The motion was put to a vote and carried...

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: I think Dean Nicolson told me that every year we will be having this privilege of meeting together, especially the small colleges, and I think if that custom is established in years to come you will probably come here every year with a definite problem in mind, and you will know where to come to instead of wandering around, as many of you do sometimes, wondering what it is all about. We will have a meeting of this kind as a clearing house. Do you think it is wise to have a meeting of this kind?

PROFESSOR RIDER: I am very much in favor of it myself.



CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: Do you think, Colonel, it is a good move, a good plan?

COL. KELLOGG: I do, indeed.

PROFESSOR RIDER: There are various things that come up from year to year that some of us would like to thrash out with others, and this is a good place to do it.

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: The question of athletic fees has often come up. Next year, at Gettysburg, we are going to charge each student an athletic fee of \$20. It might be interesting to you to know that. That is quite an athletic fee.

PROFESSOR RIDER: That goes to all athletics?

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: Yes, all to athletics.

PROFESSOR RIDER: What is your enrollment?

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: About 625.

PROFESSOR RIDER: Do the girls pay the same as the boys?

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: Yes, everybody. Our fee is put on the college bill and paid to the treasurer of the college.

PROFESSOR RIDER: Do you anticipate any objection on the part of the students to fees as high as that?

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: We put it in the Board of Trustees' hands and they voted it last June, but it doesn't go in effect for a period of one year; so we put it in this year's catalog, and it will appear as an athletic fee of \$20, so that everyone will know about it.

QUESTION: Does that only apply to the new students or all the students?

CHAIRMAN BILHEIMER: It affects everyone in the college, and we have a student chest fund of \$10 which covers the weekly paper and dances and dramatic club and all that. It is allocated by a faculty and student committee. I thought that might be of some interest.

If there is nothing else, we will adjourn, gentlemen. Thank you, very much, for coming here and participating.

...The meeting adjourned at ten o'clock...

## APPENDIX II

### REPORT OF THE TREASURER, 1936

FRANK W. NICOLSON, in account with the  
NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

1936	Dr.		
Jan. 1	To balance carried forward	\$5,538.35	
	University of Baltimore	25.00	
9	Physical Education Association (program)	12.00	
	Football Coaches Association (program)	12.00	
13	Northwestern University	25.00	
15	Student Health Association (program)	12.00	
	University of Wichita	25.00	
21	Carleton College	25.00	
25	American Sports Publishing Co.:		
	Royalty on Football Rules	\$1,577.40	
	Royalty on Track Rules	133.71	1,711.11
Feb. 3	DePauw University	25.00	
10	University of Georgia	25.00	
Mar. 5	J. E. Raycroft, Handbook on Athletic Injuries	7.80	
6	King College	25.00	
10	University of North Dakota	25.00	
13	University of Miami	25.00	
31	Western Reserve University	25.00	
Apr. 10	Gettysburg College	25.00	
	Manhattan College	25.00	
	University of Tennessee	25.00	
	U. S. Military Academy	25.00	
	Oberlin College	25.00	
	Swarthmore College	25.00	
	University of Nebraska	25.00	
	Miami University	50.00	
	Denison University	25.00	
	Dartmouth College	25.00	
	Hamilton College	25.00	
	U. S. Naval Academy	25.00	
	Ohio Northern University	25.00	
	Franklin and Marshall College	25.00	
	Mt. St. Mary's College	25.00	
	Worcester Polytechnic Institute	25.00	
11	Cornell University	25.00	
	Yale University	25.00	
	University of New Hampshire	25.00	
13	Ohio University	25.00	
	Clemson Agricultural College	25.00	
	Rice Institute	25.00	
	Colgate University	25.00	
	Western State Teachers College	25.00	
	University of Chicago	25.00	
	Duke University	50.00	
14	Colorado Agricultural College	25.00	



		University of Rochester	25.00	
15		Boston College	25.00	
		Mass. Institute of Technology	25.00	
		Case School of Applied Science	25.00	
		Vanderbilt University	25.00	
16		Syracuse University	50.00	
		Union College	25.00	
		Dickinson College	25.00	
		Susquehanna University	25.00	
		University of Virginia	25.00	
17		Princeton University	25.00	
		American Sports Publishing Co.:		
		Royalty on Soccer Rules	\$83.73	
		Royalty on Ice Hockey Rules	81.15	
		Royalty on Wrestling Rules	44.61	
		Royalty on Swimming Rules	84.09	293.58
18		Tulane University	25.00	
21		Wesleyan University	25.00	
		University of Pittsburgh	25.00	
22		Conn. State College	25.00	
23		Columbia University	25.00	
		Hobart College	25.00	
24		Kansas State College	50.00	
		University of Notre Dame	25.00	
25		University of Delaware	25.00	
		Geneva College	25.00	
28		Brown University	25.00	
		College of the City of New York	25.00	
29		Alfred University	25.00	
May	1	University of Pennsylvania	25.00	
		Royalties on Basketball Rules	1,138.39	
		New York University	25.00	
2		Stevens Institute of Technology	25.00	
		University of Cincinnati	25.00	
5		Temple University	25.00	
6		West Chester State Teachers College	25.00	
7		Trinity College	25.00	
8		Lafayette College	25.00	
11		Michigan State College	50.00	
15		Mass. State College	25.00	
18		Ohio State University	25.00	
19		Georgetown University	25.00	
25		Virginia Intercollegiate Athletic Association	25.00	
28		Marquette University	25.00	
June	3	University of Oklahoma	75.00	
	11	Johns Hopkins University	25.00	
	13	Rhode Island State College	50.00	
	22	Bradley Polytechnic Institute	25.00	
		Ohio Wesleyan University	25.00	
		University of Texas	25.00	
	23	Centenary College	50.00	
	27	University of Utah	50.00	
	29	Wooster College	25.00	
July	6	N. C. A. A. Track Meet loan returned	500.00	
	13	Penn. Military College	25.00	
Aug.	8	Interest, Savings Bank	45.98	
	28	University of Colorado	25.00	
Sept.	1	Interest, Savings Bank	28.77	
	8	San Jose State College	25.00	

	28	Southern Methodist University	50.00	
Oct.	3	Amherst College	25.00	
		Rutgers University	25.00	
		Mercersburg Academy	10.00	
		Harvard University	25.00	
6		Lawrence College	25.00	
		Duquesne University	25.00	
		University of Maryland	25.00	
7		Boston University	25.00	
		Ohio State University	25.00	
8		Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute	25.00	
		Phillips Andover Academy	10.00	
		Catholic University of America	25.00	
9		Bates College	25.00	
		Butler University	25.00	
		Middlebury College	25.00	
10		University of Georgia	25.00	
		University of Michigan	25.00	
		Williams College	25.00	
12		Bowdoin College	25.00	
		Georgetown University	25.00	
		University of Maine	25.00	
13		University of California	25.00	
14		Lehigh University	25.00	
		U. S. Coast Guard Academy	25.00	
15		Howard University	25.00	
16		Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	25.00	
17		Haverford College	25.00	
		Loyola University	25.00	
19		Alabama Polytechnic Institute	25.00	
		Purdue University	25.00	
		University of Washington	25.00	
21		Tufts College	25.00	
		Indiana University	25.00	
23		University of Detroit	25.00	
24		Baylor University	25.00	
26		Allegheny College	25.00	
		Georgia School of Technology	25.00	
		Michigan State Normal School	25.00	
		St. Lawrence University	25.00	
28		College of Agriculture, University of California	25.00	
		Knox College	25.00	
		University of Southern California	25.00	
29		Lawrenceville School	10.00	
30		University of Minnesota	25.00	
		University of Vermont	25.00	
Nov.	2	Carnegie Institute	25.00	
		Northwestern University	25.00	
		Texas A. and M. College	25.00	
	7	Creighton University	25.00	
		Drake University	25.00	
		Grinnell College	25.00	
		Oklahoma A. and M. College	25.00	
		University of Tulsa	25.00	
		Washburn College	25.00	
		Washington University	25.00	
		Pennsylvania State College	25.00	
14		Carleton College	25.00	
		Drexel Institute	25.00	
17		University of Oregon	25.00	



	18	Virginia Military Institute	25.00
	23	Kansas College Athletic Association	25.00
	25	University of North Carolina	25.00
	30	Iowa State College	25.00
		University of Wisconsin	50.00
Dec.	1	Ohio State University	25.00
	2	University of Idaho	25.00
	3	University of Oklahoma	25.00
	4	Coe College	25.00
		Rocky Mountain Faculty Athletic Conference	25.00
	9	Texas Christian University	25.00
		Villanova College	25.00
	10	Norwich University	25.00
	12	DePauw University	25.00
		University of Denver	25.00
	14	Border Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	25.00
	16	University of Kansas	25.00
	19	West Virginia University	75.00
	21	Centenary College	25.00
		Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	25.00
	23	Interest, Savings Bank	39.17

\$13,819.15

1935 CR.

Dec.	30	Lois Smith, copying	\$0.75
		Whitehead & Hoag Co., convention expenses	31.15
		W. D. Scott, committee on federal tax	22.55
		J. F. Martin, convention expenses	15.00
		Wesleyan Store, postage	8.00

1936

Jan.	2	Pelton & King, postage \$19.56, printing \$143.50	163.06
	3	Master Reporting Co., convention expenses	38.36
	8	Hotel Pennsylvania, convention expenses	76.50
		R. W. Aigler, committee on federal tax	109.34
		F. W. Nicolson, convention expenses	25.50
	14	J. L. Griffith, convention expenses	76.10
		R. G. Clapp, wrestling rules committee	8.92
	15	S. N. E. Telephone Co., telegrams	2.11
	16	J. L. Griffith, telegrams	3.54
	18	Wesleyan Alumni Council, addressing	3.80
	25	D. Stewart, soccer rules committee	9.35
		H. W. Clark, soccer rules committee	14.50
	31	Pelton & King, postage \$14.52, printing \$101.07	115.59
Feb.	6	T. N. Metcalf, advance to N. C. A. A. meet	500.00
	10	Wesleyan Store, postage	5.00
	14	University of Chicago, track rules committee	19.61
	28	D. X. Bible, football rules committee	128.25
	29	W. J. Bingham, football rules committee	264.51
Mar.	3	Morley Jennings, football rules committee	123.91
		W. G. Crowell, football rules committee	243.95
		W. R. Okeson, football rules committee	243.95
		Pelton & King, postage \$59.60, printing \$551.36	610.96
	4	Wesleyan Store, postage	.96
	11	W. S. Langford, football rules committee	200.00
Apr.	2	E. Cowie, stenographic aid	50.00
	6	L. Mahony, football rules committee	108.95
		E. G. Schroeder, wrestling rules committee	125.08
		R. G. Clapp, wrestling rules committee	149.14

		C. F. Foster, wrestling rules committee	45.23
	14	S. N. E. Telephone Co., telegrams	4.80
		Oswald Tower, basketball rules committee	37.50
	15	A. A. Stagg, football rules committee	32.76
		L. F. Keller, ice hockey rules committee	108.53
	22	W. A. Witte, basketball rules committee	140.90
	23	H. J. Stegeman, football rules committee	161.25
	27	D. B. Swingle, wrestling rules committee	154.61
		Edgar Fauver, executive committee	10.00
	28	W. E. Meanwell, basketball rules committee	121.10
		W. S. Langford, football rules committee	204.47
		Harvard Club of New York, executive committee	23.13
		J. L. Griffith, executive committee	76.60
		J. Stubbs, ice hockey rules committee	23.10
		A. I. Prettyman, ice hockey rules committee	28.70
		J. A. Rockwell, wrestling rules committee	86.43
		F. W. Luehring, swimming rules committee	27.98
		C. P. Miles, wrestling rules committee	28.75
	30	J. E. Lowrey, ice hockey rules committee	75.00
May	1	F. A. Rowe, basketball rules committee	200.00
	7	L. W. St. John, basketball rules committee	93.16
		Wesleyan Store, postage	5.00
	8	J. W. St. Clair, basketball rules committee	134.80
	14	A. E. Eilers, swimming rules committee	119.40
	18	E. T. Kennedy, swimming rules committee	82.70
	25	J. O. Bulkley, ice hockey rules committee	24.08
	28	F. C. Allen, basketball rules committee	74.35
June	2	Pelton & King, postage \$15.35, printing \$50.96	66.31
	4	H. G. Crisp, basketball rules committee	82.28
		Sportsmanship Brotherhood, dues	10.00
	8	C. M. Updegraff, committee on broadcasting	35.06
	9	Middletown National Bank, exchange	.25
		Wesleyan Alumni Council, addressing	3.50
		B. E. Wiggins, wrestling rules committee	10.50
		F. W. Nicolson, secretarial allowance	500.00
	24	L. Robertson, track rules committee	92.36
	27	R. W. Aigler, committee on federal tax	86.75
		H. W. Hughes, track rules committee	57.80
	29	C. Littlefield, track rules committee	87.90
		R. A. Fetzer, track rules committee	66.50
	30	Pelton & King, postage	.71
		F. P. Johnson, track rules committee	31.20
July	7	G. T. Kirby, contribution to Olympic swimming team	50.47
	17	John Bunn, basketball rules committee	49.74
	18	Brutus Hamilton, track rules committee	117.50
Aug.	10	J. L. Griffith, expenses of president's office	5.80
	28	Pelton & King, printing	5.68
Sept	1	Wesleyan Store, postage	9.50
	8	Mrs. P. Jordan, copying	1.86
	18	F. W. Nicolson, executive committee	10.00
	23	J. L. Griffith, executive committee	85.83
	24	Harvard Club, executive committee	24.23
		W. J. Bingham, executive committee	23.00
	29	R. Berry, executive committee	24.85
Oct.	3	F. W. Nicolson, expenses to inauguration	43.00
		Pelton & King, postage \$15.81, printing \$27.25	43.06
	8	Bethlehem Steel Co., football rules committee	52.32
	12	E. Cowie, stenographic aid	50.00
	19	T. E. French, committee on committees	3.00
	20	Bethlehem Steel Co., football rules committee	156.00



	26	Middletown National Bank, exchange	.25
	28	J. L. Griffith, expenses of president's office	5.05
		C. M. Updegraff, expenses to inauguration	7.25
		R. L. Sackett, executive committee	24.46
Nov.	3	Mrs. P. Jordan, postage \$4.83, copying \$1.50	6.33
	15	American Olympic Association, dues	500.00
	30	L. W. St. John, executive committee	46.40
Dec.	1	Wesleyan Alumni Council, addressing	1.95
		Pelton & King, printing	5.75
	8	Middletown National Bank, exchange	.35
		Wesleyan Alumni Council, addressing	2.10
	19	T. N. Metcalf, track rules committee	36.30
	21	Wesleyan Store, postage	6.00
	28	Amount carried forward	5,667.28
			<u>\$13,819.15</u>